

100-24

JPRS-TAC-85-014

21 June 1985

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

19980722 107

DNC QD/AM 7-22-85



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

21 June 1985

**WORLDWIDE REPORT  
ARMS CONTROL**

**GENERAL**

USSR: U.S. Data on Soviet Arms Programs Attacked (G. Kuznetsov; Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM, No 17, 19-25 Apr 85)...	1
Gromyko Views Arms Control in Article on Foreign Policy (Andrey Gromyko; Moscow PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA, No 4, Apr 85).....	4
Soviet Party-Government Victory Day Address Discusses Arms Control (Moscow PRAVDA, 10 May 85).....	6
Brandt Urges Superpower Dialogue To Avert War (Hamburg DPA, 7 May 85).....	9
Finnish Leaders' Views of Disarmament, Soviet Relations (Rafael Paro; Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET, 31 Mar 85).....	11
Swedish Left Party-Communist's Werner Discusses Arms Race (Sven Svensson; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 12 Apr 85).....	13
Sweden's Defense Minister Reviews Security Policy, Neutrality (Anders Thunborg; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 14 Apr 85)....	15
Soviet Official Interviewed on Australian Radio (Melbourne Overseas Service, 25 Mar 85).....	19
<b>Briefs</b>	
Soviet-Finnish Consultations	21
<b>U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS</b>	
Chernyshev Assails Reagan Speech to Europarliament (Moscow TASS, 8 May 85).....	22

PRAVDA Hits Nitze Comments on Soviet Negotiating Stance (Moscow PRAVDA, 3 May 85).....	24
U.S. Response to Sokolov Interview, Other Initiatives Hit (Moscow Domestic Service, 6 May 85).....	25
Gorbachev Answers French Veterans on Geneva Talks (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 7 May 85).....	27
Weekly Radio Roundtable Views Geneva, Ship Calls, SDI (Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, et. al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 21 Apr 85).....	29
Chinese Envoy to UN Asks Progress in U.S.-USSR Arms Talks (Beijing XINHUA, 9 May 85).....	33
<b>SPACE ARMS</b>	
USSR: SDI Program Said To Violate ABM Treaty (Moscow World Service, Moscow TASS, 25, 26 Apr 85).....	35
General Abrahamson Refuted Impact on Treaty, Geneva Talks	35 36
Soviet Defense Minister Interviewed on SDI, Nuclear Parity (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, TASS, 7, 8 May 85).....	38
Text of Interview State Department Response Criticized	38 43
Velikhov Criticizes SDI Claims, Space Arms Race (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 21 Apr 85).....	45
Soviet Cosmonaut Sees Offensive Goals for SDI (Georgiy Grechko; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 7 Apr 85)....	49
USSR: U.S.-FRG Report on Differences Over SDI Noted (Moscow TASS, 7 May 85).....	52
TASS Analyst Hits Weinberger for Calling SDI 'Irreversible' (Moscow TASS, 14 May 85).....	53
Thatcher Discusses SDI in DER SPIEGEL Interview (Margaret Thatcher Interview; Hamburg DER SPIEGEL, 29 Apr 85).....	55
FRG Official 'Regrets' Gorbachev's Arms Increase Threat (Hamburg DPA, 27 Apr 85).....	62
Belgian Commentary on 'Choice' Between Eureka, SDI (Guy Duplat; Brussels LE SOIR, 20-21 Apr 85).....	63

Norway 'Tacitly' Rejects SDI Participation Offer (Paris AFP, 18 Apr 85).....	66
Danish Folketing in Debate Over 'Star Wars' Stance (Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 13 Apr 85).....	67
Former Norwegian Labor Party Leader Comments on SDI (Reiulf Steen; Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET, 20 Apr 85).....	68
Dumas Rejects SDI 'Subcontractor' Role (Paris AFP, 10 May 85).....	70
Hungarian Daily Reports Sokolov TASS Interview (Budapest NEPSZABADSAG, 6 May 85).....	71
Canberra Determined Not To Endorse SDI (Melbourne Overseas Service, 10, 13 May 85).....	72
Foreign Ministry Official Briefs Parliament Satellite Testing Decried	72
<b>Briefs</b>	73
TASS on U.S. Military Rockets	73
Turkey Promises To Help SDI	73
Australian Minister on Infrared Sensing	73
<b>SALT/START ISSUES</b>	
PRAVDA Lists Alleged U.S. Violations of SALT, ABM Treaties (I. Zakharov; Moscow PRAVDA, 12 May 85).....	74
<b>INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES</b>	
Swedish Daily DAGENS NYHETER Weighs Gorbachev 'Initiative' (Editorial; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 9 Apr 85).....	78
Sweden's Palme Welcomes USSR Missile Moratorium (Lars Christiansson; Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET, 13 Apr 85).....	80
Italian CP Head Backs Soviet Initiatives (Moscow PRAVDA, 2 May 85).....	81
Netherlands Foreign Minister Sees Increase in SS-20's (Raymond van den Boogaard; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 11 Apr 85).....	82
Dutch Leaders on Missile Deployment (Amsterdam DE VOLSKRANT, 15 Apr 85).....	83
Norway's Stray Notes 'Broken Promise' of 1983 USSR Freeze (Einar Solvoll; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 25 Apr 85).....	86

Chinese Journal Assesses Gorbachev's SS-20 Proposal (Mei Zhenmin; Beijing LIAOWANG, No 17, 29 Apr 85).....	87
U.S. Statistics To Be Used in Netherlands Missile Decision (Paris AFP, 25 Apr 85).....	89
<b>CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE</b>	
Romanian Envoy Addresses Stockholm CSCE Meeting (Bucharest AGERPRES, 14 May 85).....	90
<b>CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS</b>	
USSR: U.S. Commission Urges Build-Up Before Chemical Arms Ban (N. Turkatenko; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 4 May 85).....	91
<b>NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS</b>	
Moscow Radio Notes Issue of S.E. Asia Nuclear-Free Zone (Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia, Moscow World Service, 7, 10 Mar 85).....	92
U.S. Opposition Positive Soviet Attitude	92
Norwegian, Finnish Officials Meet on Nuclear-Free Zone (Helsinki International Service, Helsinki Domestic Service, 19 Apr 85).....	94
Vayrynen on Talks	94
Vayrynen Comments on Talks	95
Norway's Stray Comments on Nuclear-Free Zone, Finland (Helsinki International Service, 17 Apr 85).....	96
Finland's Koivisto Advocates Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone (Helsinki Domestic Service, 20 Apr 85).....	98
Norwegian MP's: Change Government To Set Up Zone (Bjorn Talen; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 30 Apr 85).....	99
Swedish Foreign Ministry Aide Supports Nuclear-Free Zone (Pierre Schori; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 15 Apr 85).....	101
Swedish Foreign Policy Report Discusses Nordic Zone (Sven Svensson; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 28 Mar 85).....	103
GDR's Fischer Lauds Idea of Nuclear-Free Iberia (Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS, 4 Apr 85).....	105

Reportage on Anzus Rift With New Zealand Continues (Melbourne Overseas Service, Hong Kong AFP, various dates).....	107
Hayden Urges Stronger Ties	107
Lange Confirms U.S., Australia Ties	107
'Kangaroo' Exercise Canceled	108
Rebel Australian Labor MP's Form Anti-Nuclear Group (Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 30 Mar 85).....	109
New Zealand Opposition Leader Criticizes Nuclear Policy (Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 28 Mar 85).....	110
Canberra, Wellington Views 1944 Defense Pact Revival (Hugh White; Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, 28 Mar 85).....	111
South Pacific Forum Works for Nuclear-Free-Zone Compromise (Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 10 Apr 85).....	112
<b>Briefs</b>	
USSR at Latin America Nuclear Ban Meet	114
<b>NUCLEAR TESTING</b>	
Soviet General Views Nuclear Testing Moratorium Call (Svyatoslav Kozlov; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 22 Apr 85)...	115
USSR: Senate Subcommittee Urges Treaties' Ratification (Moscow TASS, 9 May 85).....	118
Australian, New Zealand Complaint on French Tests Noted (Moscow TASS, 11 May 85).....	119
New Zealand Critiques French Testing, Impact on Geneva Talks (Hong Kong AFP, 13 May 85).....	120

GENERAL

USSR: U.S. DATA ON SOVIET ARMS PROGRAMS ATTACKED

PM301429 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 17, 19-25 Apr 85 (signed to Press  
18 Apr 85) p 6

[G. Kuznetsov "Polemical Notes": "On a Shaky Foundation of Lies"]

[Text] As is known, spring is the beautiful season of the reawakening of nature, but every year at this time, at the same time as the blossoming of the pink magnolia decorating many of the city's streets and the Japanese cherry trees bordering the pool in front of the Jefferson Memorial, the U.S. capital is affected by an attack of an unusual fever. This has nothing to do with hayfever, however. The virus which causes it belongs to the military-political category, and the most striking symptom of the disease is severe delirium among the highest officials of the U.S. Administration about the "growing Soviet threat" and the "Russians' military superiority," due of course to the "sharp buildup by the Soviets" of their military might and, as a result, the "laggardness" of the United States. This virus always spreads in Washington's corridors of power when Congress starts to discuss the draft military budget, which is growing year by year and has now reached \$313.7 billion in the form of direct appropriations to the Pentagon alone.

In an interview for THE WASHINGTON POST on various foreign policy problems, President Reagan paid much attention to military questions. It is striking, however, that literally all his remarks do not, to put it mildly, correspond with the facts; more exactly, they deliberately distort the realities. In the blatant desire to secure from Congress the allocation of all the billions requested to prepare for war, he resorted to a "trump" card, albeit blatantly marked, by asserting that statements that parity exists in the military sphere between the United States and the USSR are the "most ludicrous utterances" he has ever heard. "The Soviet Union is really superior to us numerically in any type of weapon you care to name," the President alleged.

Of course, it is difficult to suppose that a head of state who is the recipient of the most extensive information is so scandalously misinformed. So it is impossible not to ask the question: Why does President Reagan disregard a report by the U.S. Armed Forces' Joint Chiefs of Staff, which, as they say, vigilantly guards the Pentagon's interests day and night?

This report was submitted to Congress just over a year ago, and it is written there in black and white: "At the present time approximate nuclear parity exists between the United States and the Soviet Union." Since its publication, the President and defense secretary have boasted more than once that, thanks to their efforts, U.S. military might has increased considerably.

However, logic has never been the ally of those who build a policy on a deliberate and malevolent lie. It is on this shaky foundation that the latest edition of the booklet "Soviet Military Power," published by Weinberger's department, is based. In their attempt to shift the blame by falsely accusing the USSR of competing in all types of armaments, and primarily of elaborating plans to put weapons into near-earth space in order to divert attention from their own "star wars" program, the authors of this lampoon also have in their sights the members of the U.S. Congress: It is on them that the new appropriations depend. They are also aiming at the U.S. allies, whom they want to harness to the Pentagon's military-space chariot.

However, why talk about the rank-and-file hacks from the military department when the example is set for them by the boss himself? While recently giving the standard publicity speech in support of the "star wars" plans to members of the U.S. Society of Newspaper Editors, Weinberger set himself the task of slandering the USSR by accusing it of creating antisatellite weapons in violation of the ABM treaty. Yet not possessing any real facts (and we will disregard here the concoctions in the booklet!), he had thought up a cunning formula, asserting that the Soviet Union "is possibly preparing" to violate this agreement!

The propaganda canard launched by the secretary was even unable to cross the Potomac River on which the Pentagon is situated. "There is undoubtedly a gap in the sphere of antimissile defense, but in our favor," J. Pike, assistant director for space research of the U.S. Scientists' Federation, refuted Weinberger.

The administration is also resorting to unscrupulous propaganda methods when, without foundation, it ascribes to the USSR's imaginary violations of the SALT II treaty, which Reagan also expounded on in his interview. The background to this ballyhoo is no secret: The U.S. Navy is preparing for running trials of the new Ohio-class submarine Alaska, and when it is commissioned the missile ceiling established by the treaty will be exceeded.

The Trident system is part of the Pentagon's extensive offensive weapons program, which also includes MX missiles, the B-1 bomber, and, subsequently, the "Stealth" technology. Reagan too is agitating for its implementation, not even hesitating to resort to overt falsehoods when applying the propagandist touches to his efforts. In his WASHINGTON POST interview, deliberately keeping silent about the USSR's proposals to ban nuclear weapons as the first step forward their complete elimination and to institute a unilateral moratorium pledging the Soviet Union not to deploy antisatellite systems for as long as the United States refrains from doing so, he asserted that he "had received no reply" to his proposal to "take to its conclusion the work of destroying nuclear weapons."

However, when our country made specific new proposals to achieve this aim, to impose reciprocal moratorium on work in the sphere of space weapons and for both countries to freeze strategic arms and halt the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, the White House incumbent called all this "propaganda" simply because he intends to build up arms by using the well-worn pretext of an "American lag." True, Reagan was wary of quoting figures here, but his aides play with them shamelessly.

Thus, the White House deputy press secretary announced a 10-fold USSR superiority in medium-range means, while the President's national security adviser, McFarlane, announced at the same time without a trace of embarrassment that the USSR has a 3:1 superiority over the United States in missile might. He juggled the figures with the single aim of promoting the plan for the unilateral disarmament of the

Soviet Union: "to reduce the number of ground-launched missiles the Russians have, increase the number of U.S. missiles, and neutralize the Russians' advantage with the aid of U.S. defense systems which will protect our weapons." Moreover, the President's adviser did not hesitate to use direct blackmail too: "It is advantageous for the Russians to reduce the existing level of their forces in order to induce us not to go beyond the defined framework in the deployment of our own armaments. The U.S. strategic program is a powerful stimulus encouraging the Russians to limit their Armed Forces..."

Thus, there is no doubt that Washingtonians are affected by a severe malady. Rear Admiral Gene La Rocque, retired, provided a diagnosis of the disease when he said: "Every year at this time the Pentagon starts a propaganda campaign in an attempt to frighten the U.S. public to death and force it to support a new buildup of appropriations for the arms race." M.S. Gorbachev defined the cause of this phenomenon in a conversation with the editor of PRAVDA: "Washington gambles on force and does not conceal this fact. It is counting on a superior force that would subjugate the rest of the world to America. Diplomacy and talks there are literally subordinated to missiles and bombers."

CSO: 5200/1129

GENERAL

GROMYKO VIEWS ARMS CONTROL IN ARTICLE ON FOREIGN POLICY

AU010601 Moscow PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA in Russian No 4, Apr 85,  
pp 5-11

[Article by Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR minister of foreign affairs: "Following the Leninist Course in Foreign Policy"]

[Excerpt]

In the tense situation, fraught with dangerous unexpected consequences, that has developed in recent years through the fault of the aggressive forces of imperialism, the peoples of the world see particularly clearly how the Soviet Union is doing everything in its power to reliably safeguard the primary human right, the right to life. This policy raises their hopes that matters will not come to a catastrophe.

Every sensible person will agree that peace without war cannot be achieved by increasing military arsenals and through newer and newer mountains of weapons. The position of those who claim the opposite is not simply absurd. It is criminal.

The Soviet Union loudly and clearly declared itself in favor of outlawing nuclear weapons as soon as they first appeared. Our country strove to ban these weapons both at the time when it possessed none of them itself and after it had produced its own nuclear weapons. Now we also advocate an immediate adoption of measures to reduce and, in the final analysis, completely liquidate nuclear weapons. The complex of initiatives taken by us, which are of an all-embracing nature, is directed to this goal.

The USSR has taken an unprecedentedly bold action by unilaterally assuming the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It continues to appeal to the nuclear powers that have not yet done the same to assume analogous obligations. This would also be a tangible contribution to establishing international confidence.

There are also other currently important issues concerning nuclear weapons that lend themselves to autonomous solutions. For instance, why could not an agreement banning nuclear weapons tests generally be concluded right now? We are in favor of reaching an agreement on this at any time; the sooner, the better.

In the entire diversity of views on the ways to approach the dismantling of the nuclear pyramid, the common denominator that stands out is the demand for freezing nuclear

weapons, which is spreading through all parts of the world. Considering this demand as reasonable and substantiated, our country has made a corresponding proposal. This proposal is well known to other nuclear powers and continues to be in effect.

We are convinced that the observance by all nuclear powers, as the Soviet Union has proposed, of certain norms by which they should be guided in the conditions that have developed, would be of essential significance. These norms are natural if one sets himself the goals of peace.

The plans for the outer space militarization represent a new mortal threat to mankind. These plans have found their expression in the construction of a large-scale anti-missile defense system contemplated by Washington.

Moving the arms race to outer space can turn into an irreversible process if it is not stopped in good time. The Soviet Union believes that effective measures should be taken to preserve a peaceful outer space.

All use of force in outer space vis-a-vis the earth and from the earth in relation to outer space must be banned without delay. There is no other choice. This Soviet position enjoys the widest support in the world. This was demonstrated with all force at the latest session of the UN General Assembly that, following our proposal, adopted a decision in favor of preventing the outer space militarization and of using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes. On the other hand, those who in this vitally important issue place themselves against the aspirations of the peoples found themselves totally isolated.

The Soviet-U.S. agreement, achieved in Geneva, to open the negotiations between the two powers on space and nuclear weapons was received everywhere as good news. The American side's discussion on the subject and goals of these negotiations was politically strained, but in the end it nevertheless agreed that neither the question of strategic arms nor the question of medium-range nuclear weapons can be discussed without also discussing the question of preventing the arms race in outer space.

Thus, a step forward was made in arranging a dialogue between the USSR and the United States on the problems that decisively influence our relations with the United States. It goes without saying that in comparison with the enormous tasks included in the agenda of the Geneva negotiations, this is only a step.

We cannot fail to also note the joint initiative of the socialist states regarding the conclusion of an agreement on mutual renunciation of the use of military force between the states of the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic alliance.

The Soviet Union has submitted the basic provisions of such an agreement for consideration by the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. This and several other major proposals of states of the socialist community have been raised in combination with definite confidence-building measures in the military field. We are in favor of ensuring that the work of the Stockholm forum be productive and that it be concluded successfully.

The Soviet Union has believed and continues to believe that no step leading to a reduction of tension and to a positive development of relations between states in Europe can be superfluous. It is important to preserve and consolidate the all-European process that was initiated by the signing of the CSCE Final Act in Helsinki 10 years ago.

The barometer of the world's political weather depends to a great extent on the state of affairs in Europe. This has been confirmed by a deterioration of that weather, which was brought about by the beginning of the siting of new American nuclear missiles on the territory of the FRG, Britain, and Italy.

GENERAL

SOVIET PARTY-GOVERNMENT VICTORY DAY ADDRESS DISCUSSES ARMS CONTROL

PM101037 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 May 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[*"Address' to the Peoples, Parliaments, and Governments of All Countries' on the 40th Anniversary of the End of World War II"*]

[Excerpts] Four decades ago the battle of the freedom-loving peoples against fascism, which had set out to win world domination, ended victoriously. The victory of worldwide historical importance over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism was won by the common efforts of the peoples and armies of the countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, partisans, resistance fighters, anti-fascists, democrats, patriots, and millions of freedom fighters.

On 1 August 1975, the states that participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed the Final Act in Helsinki in which they mapped out ways to "overcome confrontation stemming from the character of their relations in the past and to better mutual understanding." The foundations of detente were laid by the joint efforts of states and it demonstrated its indubitable advantages and benefits for everyone.

The peoples are marking the 40th anniversary of victory in the aggravated, dangerous situation, which has been brought about by the U.S. and NATO course of tipping the military-strategic equilibrium and seeking military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty member-states. The hopes to dominate the world and dictate to others, including the Soviet Union, are futile and dangerous to all the peoples.

The situation in Europe, which was swept by the whirlwind of two devastating world wars, causes great worry. Huge masses of armed forces and arms arsenals are directly confronting each other here; U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles continue to be deployed in Western Europe, and the revisionist forces, trying to call into question the results of the war and postwar development, primarily the postwar European political and territorial realities, have become more active.

Certain forces in Europe and outside it have not given up their dangerous plans to subvert the historical Yalta and Potsdam agreements, which laid the foundations of postwar peace.

Those agreements have been dependably serving the interests of European security and blocking militarist and revanchist ambitions for 40 years now. Any attempt to encroach upon those agreements is doomed.

The earth is a common home for all the peoples, for mankind as a whole. The Soviet people do not need land belonging to others. We do not impose our world outlook and way of life on anyone. It is in vain that the trumpeters of the "crusade" and "psychological warfare" are trying to mislead the international public with myths about the "Soviet military threat." History and today's real facts show differently. The Soviet Union has never attacked anyone, but has had more than once to repulse invasions of aggressors. The Soviet people need peaceful conditions for creative work and for the further perfecting of society of developed socialism. Our ideal and constant concern is universal and complete disarmament and a lasting and just peace.

The safeguarding of peace was and remains the supreme goal of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. The foreign policy of peace bequeathed to us by Lenin is formalized in the USSR Constitution. It stems from the very nature of socialist society.

It is our conviction that war is not fatally inevitable. There can be no goals that could justify the unleashing of nuclear war. There are no international disputes that could not be settled at the negotiating table. Detente and businesslike cooperation can and must be a natural and constant condition of international affairs. Reason must prevail over recklessness and madness.

The Soviet Union urges the peoples and states and their parliaments and governments to do everything possible to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, and to limit, reduce and eventually eliminate completely nuclear weapons.

It is unthinkable to reach agreement on the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments under conditions of space militarization. Space militarization would become a catalyst of the uncontrollable arms race in every field and lead to another, even more dangerous round of that race and to the dramatic decline of strategic stability.

It is sensible to have certain norms to regulate relations between powers possessing nuclear weapons. They should, we believe, provide for the prevention of nuclear war, renunciation of propaganda of nuclear war, and the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, to prevent their proliferation and to work for the reduction of nuclear armaments to the point of their complete elimination. The Soviet Union is prepared to reach accord with other nuclear powers at any time jointly to recognize such norms and make them binding.

On the 40th anniversary of the great victory over fascism, the Soviet Union reiterates its obligation, assumed unilaterally, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and again urges the other nuclear powers, which have not yet done so, to assume similar obligations.

The document "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and the Maintenance of Relations of Peace," submitted by the Soviet side to the participants in the Stockholm conference, meets the interests of lessening tension. That initiative is aimed at achieving the main goal of the conference. The pivotal provision of the proposed treaty could be the obligation not to be the first to use against each other either nuclear or conventional weapons and, therefore, not to use armed forces against each other at all.

We call upon the governments of European states, the United States, and Canada to take effective steps completely to rid the European Continent of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. Europe must be freed from chemical weapons as well. Stronger peace and security here could be promoted by the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones in the Balkans, in Nordic Europe and in other parts of the continent and by a freeze on or cuts in military spending.

The Soviet Union calls upon the states participating in the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe and in the Vienna talks on mutual reductions of the armed forces and armaments in central Europe to take measures without delay to achieve mutually acceptable accords.

Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Council of Ministers of the USSR.

CSO: 5200/1156

GENERAL

BRANDT URGES SUPERPOWER DIALOGUE TO AVERT WAR

LD071233 Hamburg DPA in German 1002 GMT 7 May 85

[Text] Nuremberg, 7 May (DPA) -- With its conceptions on peace policy, the SPD again wants to win over the majority of federal citizens, as it was already once able to do in the federal elections in 1972. At the central SPD event dedicated to 8 May, Willy Brandt, the head of the party, stressed on Tuesday in Nuremberg: "We were able to manage it in 1972 even though reverses were unable to be prevented. The Social Democratic Party now also wants to win the majority for itself, in the second half of the eighties, for the next phase of the peace policy." Brandt judged: "We now need a new phase in East-West politics." The leaders of the SPD summarized his considerations in five points:

-- The FRG finds itself "for the very first time in the common desire for detente. The aim is an enduring order of peace."

-- The FRG has its future in Europe and has "an increased duty to have regard for neighbors who have to suffer more than enough misery in the West and East."

-- The power of the Soviet Union and the United States and their relationship has "objectively become a threat to life." From this, those who have less power derived the right "to press the two over-powerful ones to limit their power and to agree on rules for securing world peace."

-- If U.S. President Ronald Reagan and the Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev "get together over the next few weeks," then one has to expect "that they will end the threat of the all-annihilating world conflicts." This will obviously work only when one side does not question the right of the other to exist and if both "reach the understanding that they can only achieve security with other." There have to be negotiations between the two superpowers on dismantling medium-range and other nuclear weapons, on renouncing space weapons and on "diverting part of the crazy resources for arms" in the first case, to the struggle against world hunger. "If the overdue summit of the superpowers leads to an agreement to prevent World War III then this would be more than most things that are spoken about these days."

Finally, Brandt renewed the SPD demands for nuclear-free zones in Europe, for a reduction in troops, the outlawing of chemical weapons, and the step-by-step conversion to armaments which can be evaluated by the enemy as defensive. In addition, the Europeans have to speak against a restriction of East-West trade. "Whoever does business with each other does not shoot at each other."

Brandt recalled the 40th anniversary of the end of the war and fascism in Germany and said that Nazism had "taught the world horror without precedent." "It is not in the

name of Germans that terrors took place, but by Germans." Whoever does not want to look the truth in the face "should be silent." At least "in the extreme wing of the German right-wing," there is a "bedevilled inability to learn." Whoever refuses to acknowledge reality "forgets the victims only too easily or pours scorn over the dead."

At the same time, Brandt also requested "our foreign friends not to overlook those sacrifices which opponents of the Nazis had to make long before the war. A great tribute in blood was demanded of the German Social Democrats." The SPD is fighting today for the broadest possible assent of all citizens that force might never again be a means for reaching some particular foreign political aim: that the borders "such as emerged out of Hitler's war are not questioned by us, that the Federal Republic raises no territorial demands against anyone," and "that never again should attacks emanate from German soil, but rather, it is hoped, many peaceful worlds."

Brandt described the strengthening of peace as the "central vital interest of the Germans -- in the Federal Republic as in the GDR." The division of Europe took place on German soil. "Proclamations without reference to reality are senseless and damaging in Germany." In clear allusion to the preparations and course of the visit to the FRG by U.S. President Reagan, with the journey to the Bitburg soldiers' cemetery, Brandt complained that "lack of spirit and tact" had allowed it to be forgotten "which victims are to be commemorated first," and "gestures piling up can become a farce and can thus have an embarrassing effect."

Clearly addressed to the coalition [CDU/CSU/FDP] which not only wants to deny National Socialism and also other crimes equally offensive, Brandt said, "Whoever seeks to render Auschwitz harmless by way of expulsions, has understood nothing and remains dangerous." The Social Democrats also speak "openly of the victims who were linked together with escape and expulsion," but "any account-keeping is absurd."

CSO: 5200/2608

GENERAL

FINNISH LEADERS' VIEWS OF DISARMAMENT, SOVIET RELATIONS

PM101355 Helsinki HUVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 31 Mar 85 pp 2, 4

[Editorial by Rafael Paro: "Signs of a Thaw"]

[Text] In the last week the Republic's political leadership has been devoting itself to foreign policy issues in different ways. In his capacity as chairman of the Socialist International's disarmament committee Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa has undertaken a major trip with visits to both Moscow and Washington. On Wednesday [27 March] Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen addressed current defense policy and made a number of comments on Finland's attitude to the arms race in space, for example. On Thursday the Center Party newspapers published sections of the statements made by President Mauno Koivisto to centrist chief editors invited to the presidential palace. What attracted the greatest attention was the fact that the president expressed concern at the jibes being directed against the Soviet Union.

These simultaneous moves by the president, prime minister, and foreign minister attracted a certain amount of attention because for a fairly long period a relatively "low profile" has marked Finnish political activity. The meager activity has generally been explained by saying that in a time of increasing tensions in superpower relations, there is not much a small, neutral country can do to ease those tensions.

No particularly far-reaching conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the statements made by Koivisto, Sorsa, and Vayrynen. As far as their assessments of the world situation are concerned certain variations can be seen. Prime Minister Sorsa, who once spoke in very pessimistic terms about the chances of a U.S.-Soviet dialogue as long as President Reagan remains in the White House, does now see some chance of serious negotiations.

Sorsa and his committee cannot really be accused of optimism. But in both Moscow and Washington the Socialist International's representatives received support for their view that 1985 is a year of central significance and that we should not make do with a freeze of the present situation but should instead strive to achieve reductions in the nuclear arsenals. In his press statements Sorsa pointed to the importance of partial results in improving the international atmosphere. Such are the Vienna and Stockholm negotiations and the resumed negotiations in Geneva. Sorsa's own summary was: "It would be exaggerating to say that I am now more optimistic, but I am a little less pessimistic."

It had obviously fallen to the lot of Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen to make a statement on Finland's attitude to the arms race in space. Moscow has probably been interested for a while to hear what the official position is. According to the foreign minister, Finland is worried about how things will go if the Soviet Union and the United States do not reach an agreement on halting the arms race in space. He also stressed that space projects should be peaceful and aim to benefit all mankind.

It is probably difficult to go any further than this without completely erasing our efforts to keep out of the superpowers' conflicts. There is no doubt that public opinion is more critical of the advanced space programs put forward in the United States recently. But in official foreign policy it is undoubtedly more important to underline our general opposition to the arms race, including the nuclear arms race. The objective sought must be general security at a lower level of armaments.

If a measure of the foreign minister's pessimism or optimism is wanted, it is notable that he said that the CSCE jubilee will probably be celebrated at the foreign minister level, "but participation at a higher level is still thought possible." No one engages in such guesswork if he does not consider there has been a clear improvement in superpower relations in recent months.

While the president's two ministers have in this way been cautiously painting the situation in somewhat hopeful colors, the president himself called on us not to expect too much either of the CSCE jubilee or of disarmament efforts. "It would certainly be no miracle if we soon found ourselves living again in an atmosphere of disappointment," Koivisto said.

It is, of course, sober realism to speak in this way. But the president himself showed that he has not forgotten the importance of striving for lofty goals when he stressed that the plan for a Nordic nuclear-free zone has a psychological significance. The project is valuable in this respect alone, even if it is not possible to realize it immediately. It gives people hope, the president said.

Ever since World War II it has been the task of our president to warn against making jibes at our large neighbor to the east. In his conversation with the Center Party's chief editors President Koivisto considered the time ripe to raise the matter. The target group for his remarks was certainly not the Center Party newspapers. We must rather assume that the president considered these newspapers a suitable medium for spreading his message.

It was perhaps best that no individual author, researcher, or youth newspaper was named. In many cases the subsequent polemics about whether it was justified to name them could have led to new limitations on freedom of speech which no one would like. But the remark about jibes is founded on the old knowledge that our eastern neighbor often takes our written word a great deal more seriously than we do ourselves. However, expressions of displeasure are considerably fewer than in past decades. Relations between our countries are basically the same as they have been since the forties. And there is good reason to protect them.

CSO: 5200/2570

GENERAL

SWEDISH LEFT PARTY-COMMUNIST'S WERNER DISCUSSES ARMS RACE

PM161556 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 12 Apr 85 p 8

[Sven Svensson report: "The United States Controls The World's Arms Race"]

[Text] The United States carries the main responsibility for the arms race in the world, but the Soviet Union also shares the responsibility. This was stressed by Left Party-Communist leader Lars Werner when he was given the opportunity for the first time yesterday to talk about security policy to the Foreign Policy institute in Stockholm's Old Town.

"for the past few years there has been military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies," Werner said.

"What the arms buildup and international tension are about is the fact that the United States does not accept this balance. But the Soviet Union too has very determinedly built up its military strength and developed and deployed new nuclear arms," Lars Werner said. The invasion of Afghanistan also helped to further sour the international climate.

The Left Party-Communists have several times turned to the Soviet Union with calls for various disarmament measures. "Nowadays we do our own analyses and adopt independent stances and often reach conclusions completely different from those reached in Moscow," Werner continued. "We pursue the calls we consider correct and necessary -- regardless of what views are currently held in Moscow."

"But it also happens that we voice support for Soviet disarmament proposals. For example, we take a positive view of General Secretary Gorbachev's announcement of a freeze on the deployment of medium-range missiles until November. A main task must be to tear down the mutual distrust which exists between the superpowers -- a distrust which is a security risk as least as great as nuclear arms."

Today the Nordic area has been drawn deeply into military and nuclear strategies, Werner also said. He does not consider that Sweden has a lively security policy debate. "We have a too polemical and inadequate debate on various partial issues in security policy," he said. "The debate is chiefly about submarines and how large our military spending should be. We support the government's general foreign policy line but are worried about developments in trading policy with increased dependence on foreign countries."

Werner stressed in particular the dangers of the U.S. embargo policy which has also affected Sweden. The fact that the security policy debate deals with military spending

is in Werner's view due to the fact that analyses are carried out by the military and by defense politicians.

"Instead of reaching defense policy decisions every 5 years, we should have an overall security policy decision. This would promote a more businesslike and more constructive security policy debate which would introduce other questions into the discussions."

Lars Werner also mentioned the JAS [fighter/attack/reconnaissance] aircraft which at the time the Left Party-Communists voted against. "We should be prepared for it to be the last Swedish combat aircraft," he said. "We should instead begin today to investigate the use of missiles and new types of anti-aircraft defenses. Aircraft are too expensive."

Lars Werner ended his speech with criticism of the Moderate Coalition Party. "Today there are clear tendencies toward more fundamental differences of opinion of a more purely ideological character which have at their heart the very point of departure for Sweden's policy of neutrality," he said.

"One political party and various nonsocialist politicians represent views and assessments about neutrality policy, about superpower antagonisms, about detente and disarmament endeavors which are easier to reconcile with Reagan's world view than with Sweden's traditional policy of neutrality," Werner said.

CSO: 5200/2608

GENERAL

SWEDEN'S DEFENSE MINISTER REVIEWS SECURITY POLICY, NEUTRALITY

PM180833 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 14 Apr 85 p 5

[Swedish Defense Minister Anders Thunborg article: "What Needs To Be Changed?"]

[Text] During the 2 years that I have been defense minister I have hardly made a single public appearance without stressing strongly that it is a tremendous asset for Swedish security policy that in all important respects there is political agreement about the foundations of this security policy. This political agreement on security policy is valuable in itself because it shows the rest of the world that security policy is built on national support. You can rely on Swedish security policy.

In the light of this I consciously avoid talking about "Social Democratic Security policy." I prefer to talk about "Swedish security policy." But as a Social Democrat I feel a particular pride over the fact that throughout the postwar period it is Social Democrats who have shaped, defended, and developed the Swedish policy of neutrality. In an article [Moderate Coalition Party security policy spokesman] Carl Bildt mentions Per Albin Hansson and Tage Erlander and speaks of "the calm and stable generations who built up the confidence in the Social Democratic Party in the field of foreign policy."

The policy of neutrality has its roots in our historical experiences and our geographic and strategic position. It is a policy which we chose ourselves and whose content we ourselves determine. It does not condemn us to silence or passivity and does not involve any requirements for any neutrality or symmetry in our utterances or sympathies.

We in Sweden have chosen the policy of neutrality because are convinced that it best corresponds to our national interest of remaining out of a possible future war and endeavoring in peacetime to preserve calm and stability in northern Europe. The policy must therefore not be formulated in such a way as to create distrust or expectations of deviations from the declared policy.

However, it is not enough simply to wish to be neutral. We must also show the rest of the world that we have the capacity to defend our territory in concrete action and repulse violations. What by our standards is a strong total defense system is therefore necessary to make the policy of neutrality credible.

These are -- in brief -- the basic elements of our policy of neutrality.

As far as I am able to understand it, these are what Carl Bildt means when he wrote (in AFTONBLADET 3 April) about "our neutralist line" and what [Moderate Coalition Party leader] Ulf Adelsohn was referring to when (in SVENSKA DAGBLADET 7 April) spoke of "the classical main line of Swedish security policy."

This support for security policy is of course most pleasing. But we should bear in mind that it is a policy which for long periods was shaped and pursued in the face of very tough political opposition from the political right which today declares its whole-hearted support for it.

Osten Unden [former Swedish foreign minister], whom the Moderates today hail as a model in Swedish foreign policy (for example, Bildt in SVENSKA DAGBLADET 18 September 1983) was subject in the fifties to very bitter attacks by the Moderates of the day and was accused of not sufficiently whole-heartedly standing on "the side of democracy" when he asserted the policy of neutrality.

Even if disregard for history seems to be a part of the Moderates' neoliberal ideology, I still think that our postwar history should dispose the Moderates toward a certain humility on the topic of security policy. But humility is certainly not a neoliberal virtue. At any rate, an awareness of the right's own security policy history in the fifties and sixties should frighten today's Moderates from their most impudent attacks, such as using Osten Unden as a weapon against the Social Democrats.

From Unden we learned maturity and self-control in foreign policy. Part of this is, for example, not accusing another state of violating Swedish territory without firm evidence. In September 1983 one of the Armed Forces commander-in-chief's reports was presented to the Foreign Affairs committee. In it the commander-in-chief reported that he had no firm base on which to voice an opinion about which nation had violated Swedish territory. Despite this, immediately after the meeting Carl Bildt made a public statement accusing the Soviet Union. A person who considers this to be reconcilable with the need for sense and good judgement in foreign policy should talk quietly -- very quietly -- about the Osten Unden legacy.

Throughout the postwar period the Social Democratic party has endeavored to safeguard agreement on security policy. In dealings with the Center Party this has never presented a problem. They have never wavered in their support for the policy of neutrality. The same is true of the Liberal Party, at least in the last 15 years.

In a few cases agreement has been made impossible by the fact that the Moderates have chosen to make statements or adopt positions which could not be reconciled with neutralist policy. Sometimes this has been due to ignorance or lack of perspective. Sometimes they have been unable to resist the temptation to make domestic political capital out of security policy. This applies both to statements directed against the present government and against the center government during the 1982 election campaign. As recently as last week there was criticism of the Moderates from center circles for this policy.

Regardless of the background it has most often fallen to the lot of the Social Democratic Party to take up the debate with the right. And every time the right has, after a while, crept back under the secure blanket of neutralist policy, as the prime minister has put it. It has not always been pleasant to have to carry on this debate. But it is a pedagogical task which we have to assume when the Moderates do not themselves realize the seriousness of their actions.

This was the case, for example, when in the fifties the right wanted to build up joint defenses for Bornholm with Denmark. This was the case at the end of the fifties when the right asserted that Sweden's defenses were based on the assumption that we would receive help from the Western powers in the event of war. This was the case when the right called for full membership in the EEC despite the fact that the Davignon report made it clear that the EEC wanted political cooperation which for reasons of neutrality ruled out Swedish membership. And this was also the case in the Vietnam years when the Right Party [former name of the Moderate Coalition Party] and Liberal Party leaders of the day took U.S. reactions as a guide for their policies.

In 1982, the Moderate Coalition Party adopted a security policy program which in certain respects is difficult to reconcile with the traditional line in Swedish security policy. In this program a totally dominant role in security policy was given to the defense forces. Peace in Europe is not possible without freedom in Eastern Europe, they said. In other respects too the Moderates launched a tough offensive over security policy.

Fortunately the situation today is different. Today the Moderates' party congress dissociates itself from calls that were official Moderate policy just a few years ago, full membership in the EEC, for example. Moderates are now essentially dissociating themselves from the spirit of ideological crusade for the liberation of Eastern Europe hinted at in their 1982 platform. Last year they agreed to a four-party settlement on defense spending and showed a real desire for an understanding.

There remain a few stupidities from the Moderate Coalition Party's youth organization and its student association which hardly need to be taken seriously but which the Moderates should dissociate themselves from. Bildt, Adelsohn, and others should feel and exercise a greater pedagogic responsibility toward these groups in the party.

Even though the Moderates stand today for a completely different and considerably more traditional security policy than they did a few years ago there is still good reason to ask for certain clarifications -- in the light of the debate in the last few weeks.

What, for example, do the Moderates mean by a "tighter foreign policy?" What is it that needs to be changed? Is it our UN policy, our support for the principles of international law on the nonuse of violence, the fight for human rights in all countries? Or is it our active policy for balanced arms limitations? Or are the Moderates perhaps hinting that the government has not taken the submarine violations seriously? If this is the case I can assure them that the policy in whose formulation I have had a hand since becoming defense minister does not mean "double messages" and does not show a trace of yielding to any superpower. It is completely groundless to accuse the government or the prime minister of anything like that.

I think that the Moderates should try to imagine what it could mean for the nation in security policy terms if accusations of this sort are repeated for a long time and are not investigated. That is why the prime minister asked his two questions, which I helped to formulate, of Ulf Adelsohn.

However, I note that Bildt, in both the Riksdag foreign policy debate and in his AFTONBLADET article, goes some way toward retracting the Moderate accusations. Now what is needed is some plain speaking from the Moderate leader.

And what do the moderates mean by a "stronger defense policy?" When I returned to the Defense Ministry after an absence of almost 10 years I cannot claim that I was particularly impressed by the dynamism in defense policy demonstrated by the nonsocialist governments.

From 1976 to 1982 the defense forces' share of GNP fell from 3.1 to 2.8 percent. In this year's Riksdag motion the Moderates are calling for an increase in defense spending of less than 1 percent. This is really much ado about very little. Together with the nonsocialist parties we have taken certain long-term decisions which ensure that the general thrust of the 1982 defense bill can be implemented. This means that together we are safeguarding a Swedish defense system which is by no means bad.

Of course it would be possible to indulge in ironies about the Moderates' opportunism and changeability. But we should be primarily pleased if the Moderates are firmly anchored in the security policy community and stop their unjust accusations. In this case, we could continue with the fundamental unity on security policy.

The Nordic area now finds itself in strategic hot water in a completely different way from in the past. Military activity close to our borders has increased. In this situation we should devote all our efforts to the substance of security policy, such as the preparations for the 1987 defense bill. We do actually have more important things to do in security policy than chew over so-called affairs. We must remember that broad political agreement on security is and will remain a hollow facade if there is no corresponding popular consensus on security and defense policy.

Today, encouragingly enough, we can note very strong popular support for our policy of neutrality and for our defense forces. For us politicians this popular backing is not only a support but also a challenge -- a challenge to try to reach agreement in the country's interest and to establish in harmony a long-term security and defense policy which responds to this strong popular confidence.

CSO: 5200/2608

GENERAL

SOVIET OFFICIAL INTERVIEWED ON AUSTRALIAN RADIO

BK251447 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1110 GMT 25 Mar 85

[From the Australian Insight Program]

[Text] Australia has been playing a prominent role in arms reductions efforts since the election of the Hawke Labor Government 2 years ago. Its high profile in arms negotiations is indicated by its appointment of Mr Richard Butler as Australia's ambassador for disarmament. Last week, Australian officials held disarmament talks with a senior Soviet official in Canberra, and in a later public meeting, the Soviet official, Dr Vladimir Petrovskiy, had some strong words to say about the development of the so-called star wars space weapons. This report is from John Lombard in Canberra:

[Begin recording] [Lombard] The Australian Labor Government has been quite firm on the star wars proposal by the American administration. It is against it. Under the plan announced by President Reagan last year, the Americans are undertaking research into laser weapons that would operate from outer space to hit Soviet missiles fired at the United States.

But the Australian position is for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, what's known as a CTB that would, quite simply, stop all testings by all nations in all environment. Mr Richard Butler has been leading the Australian approach in arms talks in Geneva, and by all reports, he has been quite successful. What has become known, then, as the Australian approach is beginning to get a much wider acceptance. This involves a comprehensive treaty with verification, and that means an international seismic data network, a remote control black-box monitoring system, an international atmospheric monitoring network, and on-sight inspection.

The Australian approach was spelled out last week to the Soviet head of the Foreign Ministry's international organizations department, Dr Vladimir Petrovskiy, who led a delegation of Soviet experts on disarmament in talks in Canberra. Later, at a public meeting, Dr Petrovskiy referred to the Reagan star wars plan and gave the Soviet position. Moscow, he said, would be prepared to negotiate drastic reductions in strategic arms, if the development of space weapons was halted.

[Petrovskiy] If you will agree that we will have more work with regard to outer space now, then immediately we will settle and will make it clear we

would be ready to go for drastic reductions in the strategic armament. I would like to stress it--drastic reduction of strategic armament including the continental ballistic missiles, nuclear medium-range and heavy bombers. And we would be ready also to speak about the freeze of the deployment of nuclear medium [as heard] weapons today. But, first we should be sure that there will be no arms race in outer space, because arms race in outer space will make us necessary to (?move) to it.

[Lombard] Dr Petrovskiy rejected suggestions that the American star wars project involved at this stage is only in research. He pointed to the fact that the atomic bomb that ended the Second World War by being dropped on Hiroshima in Japan had also begun as a research project.

[Petrovskiy] For example, it all started in the original (?New Haven) project, which was the Manhattan project. It was a research project. But in the long run, it gave out, how to say, to the use of this nuclear or atom weapon in the [word indistinct] of Hiroshima. Anyhow, every such thing started with research.

[Lombard] Dr Petrovskiy of the Soviet Union. It was revealed that at the end of the Australian-Soviet talks on disarmament that China has decided it will take part in the work toward a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. Australian officials described the Chinese decision, made known in Geneva some weeks ago, as a breakthrough for the Australian approach. Officials said China had said that if the Australian approach was adopted as a negotiating position, China would take part in the work. In previous talks, they had refused. The change of heart apparently is a result of bilateral talks on disarmament between China and Australia in Beijing last year. John Lombard, Radio Australia, Canberra. [end recording]

CSO: 5200/1138

GENERAL

BRIEFS

SOVIET-FINNISH CONSULTATIONS--Helsinki, 17 Apr (TASS)--Soviet-Finnish political consultations have been held here on a wide range of issues related to preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth, including the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Soviet side was led by Vladimir Petrovskiy, member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Finnish side by Seppo Pietinen, head of the Political Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland. Vladimir Petrovskiy was received by Paavo Vayrynen, Finnish minister for foreign affairs. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0940 GMT 17 Apr 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1142

21 JUNE 1985

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

## CHERNYSHEV ASSAILS REAGAN SPEECH TO EUROPARLIAMENT

LD081745 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 8 May 85

[Text] Moscow May 85 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The speech by U.S. President Ronald Reagan to a special session of the European Parliament has been widely publicized by his advisers and assistants in advance. They proclaimed that the President would suggest the ways of easing tension in relations between the United States and the USSR, that the speech would contain peace initiatives. What turned out in reality?

The speech indeed abounds in high-sounding phrases and bombastic slogans. Those who compiled the speech did wonderfully well. If the President's words and deeds are compared, the real value of his "peaceable" pronouncements is clearly seen.

Our task... is to keep the peace with the Soviet Union... to introduce greater stability in our relationship with it, and live together in the world, the President declares. And goes right into insinuations, direct distortion of the Soviet Union's foreign policy which can in no way be regarded as conducive to greater stability in Soviet-U.S. relations. Perhaps, the U.S. Administration renounced the policy of "countervailing" the USSR and other socialist countries at long last? No, one will look in vain for any evidence of that both in that address and other statements by the present U.S. Administration officials.

"We cannot and should not seek to build our peace and freedom perpetually upon the basis of expanding nuclear arsenals", the President declares. This premise is in principle correct. But what follows it? The chief of the White House declares that the United States should preserve a modern and viable nuclear arsenal in all the three elements of the strategic triad -- sea-, ground-, and air-based weapon systems. He specifies that this is needed, allegedly, not for the quest of superiority, but simply for the quest of balance. For what purpose does the United States prepare to install in silos 100 first-strike MX nuclear missiles, is speeding up the production of the B-1 strategic bomber, is building up the nuclear potential of surface and underwater weapons, is deploying Pershing missiles and cruise missiles in Europe, is manufacturing 17,000 new units of nuclear ammunition?

It is absolutely clear that this is being done not for the "quest of balance" but for quite a different purpose.

The President states: "The Soviet Union,... does not share our view of what constitutes a stable nuclear balance". He is right here for the Soviet Union cannot share the

United States' treatment of the notion for "balance" American-style means the advantage on the United States side. The chief of the White House was obviously pining for the past, when he recalled that early in the 70s the United States lost its superiority over the Soviet Union in the sphere of strategic nuclear arms. Ronald Reagan who announced in October 1981 his "strategic programme" for the 80s, who planned for a decade ahead a huge build-up of the United States strategic nuclear potential, asked from the rostrum in Strasbourg: "Must we accept an endless process of nuclear arms competition?" Absolutely unabashed he said emphatically: "I don't think so". Is not this the example of how Washington's deeds differ from words?

And what "peace initiatives" does the President of the United States suggest? Maybe the United States at last decided to follow the Soviet Union's good example and also assume the commitment to keep from the first use of nuclear weapons? Maybe Washington heeded Moscow's peaceful call and agrees to freeze nuclear arsenals and stop preparation for the creation of weapons to be deployed in space? No, nothing of the kind is mentioned in the President's speech, for this would interfere with Washington's ambitious plans. Reagan's "peace initiatives" turned out to be very modest and not at all new -- exchange of observers at military exercises and locations, establishing contacts between military leaders and military-to-military communications link, the expression of the readiness to "discuss" the Soviet proposal on non-use of force and then only provided that the Soviet Union agrees to military-technical confidence-building measures suggested by NATO countries in Stockholm.

But then there was "novelty", unexpectedly, in another part of the President's speech. According to him it is not the United States, but the Soviet Union that, allegedly, decided to build nuclear forces aimed at dealing a first strike. This is something new indeed. A greater absurdity is difficult to imagine. It is as if not the Soviet Union, but the United States assumed unilaterally the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. But even the most obvious lie must have a certain purpose. What is the purpose in this concrete case? The explanation is very simple. This lie is needed to "substantiate" in a new way the need for the United States to create a large-scale ABM system with elements of space basing, to work out the technology of "star wars".

By his statements and his practical deeds, the chief of the White House clearly shows that Washington's ways of "lowering tension" can carry the world into dangerous entanglements of "star wars", can lead it to nuclear catastrophe.

CSO: 5200/1147

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA HITS NITZE COMMENTS ON SOVIET NEGOTIATING STANCE

PM030821 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS headline: "Who Is Blocking the Talks?"]

[Text] Washington, 2 May -- In striving to achieve military superiority over the USSR, the Reagan administration is openly displaying an obstructionist approach toward the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. This was again borne out by Paul Nitze, adviser to the President and U.S. secretary of state on talks about arms reduction, who delivered Washington's official appraisal of the results of the first round of the Geneva talks at the National Press Club.

Nitze crudely distorted the essence of the Soviet position and patently tried to "prove" that it is not the United States but the Soviet Union that is "blocking" the achievement of progress at Geneva. By this he meant that success in the matter of working out an agreement is possible only on U.S. terms.

In this connection the adviser again confirmed the unconcealed unwillingness of the administration to seriously examine the proposals and initiatives on questions of arms limitation which the Soviet Union has put forward, having reiterated in this the often refuted arguments to the effect that a freeze of the nuclear potentials of both sides will allegedly consolidate "Soviet military superiority." Meanwhile, even Pentagon documents acknowledge the presence now of approximate parity in the nuclear sphere between the USSR and United States. The absence in the administration of a serious approach to the talks has again been demonstrated by Nitze's negative reaction to the halting right up to November this year of the further deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union, to the proposal of the introduction, for the whole period of the talks, of a moratorium on the creation, including scientific-research work, testing, and deployment of space-based strike weapons.

Nitze did not put forward a single new, specific proposal in these spheres, which confirms that the United States has nothing to counter the constructive Soviet initiatives with. The adviser merely repeated the completely discredited "ideas" that the Washington administration has issued in the past and that, as is known, are intended to ensure U.S. superiority in this or that category of weapons. At the same time, he stated that the United States would like to take the issue of nonmilitarization of space out of the framework of the Geneva talks, stressing the administration's intention to continue work on President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative."

Nitze's statement has shown convincingly that the Reagan administration is more interested in building up arms than in achieving accords with the Soviet Union on limiting them.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S. RESPONSE TO SOKOLOV INTERVIEW, OTHER INITIATIVES HIT

LD062352 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 6 May 85

[From the "International Diary," program presented by Boris Andrianov with commentary by Yevgeniy Kachanov]

[Text] Foreign news agencies devote a certain [opredelenny] amount of space to reactions to the interview Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolov, USSR minister of defense, gave to a TASS correspondent. He expressed serious concern during the interview over the Washington administration's continuing attempts to achieve unilateral military advantages over the Soviet Union, in particular in the sphere of space weapons. I am passing the microphone to my colleague, commentator Yuvgeniy Kachanov:

You are well aware, comrades, that our country has repeatedly demonstrated goodwill in its attempts to halt and reverse the arms race unleashed by the imperialist circles of the West.

The Soviet Union unilaterally halted the further deployment of its medium-range missiles a month ago to last until this November and suspended the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe. By introducing this moratorium, the Soviet leadership unambiguously demonstrated that the road to arms reduction is open. The Soviet Union is making a sensible and natural proposal. It is saying that both sides should freeze their arsenals, that preparations for the development of weapons to be deployed in space should be halted, and that this should be used as a basis for immediate reductions in armament stockpiles.

Washington's response to this initiative is well known. The White House hastily rejected it, without even acquainting itself with the details of the proposal. Meanwhile, the United States is forging ahead with continued work on the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative and attempts to make U.S. partners in NATO and other military blocs join in this work. In order to defuse the wave of world concern over Reagan's "star wars" plans, the United States is claiming that these plans are purely defensive and that they are, in fact, intended to rid mankind of nuclear weapons. In his interview with a TASS correspondent, the USSR defense minister showed in a persuasive and well-argued manner that these claims are overtly demagogic and bear no relation whatsoever to the truth.

What's more, in the United States itself they are not going out of their way to conceal the true purpose of the plans to put weapons in space. Here, for example, is a typical scenario for nuclear war against the Soviet Union. It was published in a report issued by a group of U.S. experts called the Foundation for Explaining the Purpose of

Disarmament. There is such an organization in the United States. First of all, U.S. killer satellites will destroy enemy satellites. Then a hydrogen bomb will explode over enemy cities and knock out ground communications. Trident missiles will destroy launch silos and missile launchers 15 minutes later, MX missiles will destroy everything else 30 minutes later, and space-based missile defense systems will then knock out missiles that survived the first strike.

There are other scenarios of this type, but an obligatory element in all of them is the infliction of a first nuclear strike from behind a space shield. Admittedly, the authors of such schemes fail to bear in mind for some reason that the enemy, i.e., the Soviet Union, will not sit with its arms folded and will definitely take equivalent countermeasures. This does not make the Pentagon strategists' insane schemes less dangerous, however. Against their background, the verbiage from official Washington about its wish to curb the arms race looks all the more implausible.

The other day, Michael Armacost, U.S. under secretary of state for political affairs, dotted all the i's and crossed all the t's, as the saying goes. He literally said the following: It will be a mistake to make arms control the focal point of our relations with the Soviet Union. In setting out the administration's long-term approach to Soviet-U.S. relations, he openly called for the implementation of a position-of-strength policy. He described the further buildup of military might as the United States' main task in this area. As far as the White House's approach to arms limitation is concerned, here, too, Armacost described the modernization and expansion of U.S. nuclear forces as the main component of U.S. policy in this field. He said that this process is already in full swing.

This understanding of the problem of limiting the arms race is a strange one, to put it mildly. It is disarmament in reverse, so to speak. One gets the impression that in both the nuclear and space spheres U.S. strategists are slaves to their own concept of getting away with a first strike unscathed and without punishment. But the USSR minister of defense gave a timely reminder that if the United States undermines the existing military-strategic equilibrium, the Soviet Union will be left with no choice but to take countermeasures to restore the status quo.

Furthermore, our measures will be equivalent to the threat that may be posed to the Soviet Union and its allies. At the same time, he stressed yet again that our goal is the termination of the arms race and the complete destruction of nuclear weapons everywhere.

CSO: 5200/1149

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GORBACHEV ANSWERS FRENCH VETERANS ON GENEVA TALKS

PM071035 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 May 85 Second Edition p 1

["To the National Council of the French Republican Association of War Veterans and Victims"]

[Text] "It is with great attention that I read your message permeated with interest in the success of the current Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva where questions of paramount importance for the destinies of peace, for the entire human race are discussed.

"War veterans know better than anybody else what war is and are working persistently to prevent it from recurring, especially a war with the use of nuclear weapons capable of reducing our planet to ashes.

"I can assure you: The Soviet Union came to Geneva with the firm intention to conduct constructive talks on preventing militarization of space, on radically reducing strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range weapons. Since it would be unnatural to conduct negotiations on arms reduction and at the same time keep building them up, we proposed that the Soviet Union and the U.S. introduce a moratorium for the entire duration of the talks on the development, including research, testing, and deployment of strike space weapons and freeze their strategic offensive arms. At the same time, both the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and the implementation of USSR countermeasures should be terminated.

"To facilitate the search for accords we, as you know, introduced a unilateral moratorium starting from April 7, 1985 on the deployment of our medium-range missiles and suspended the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe caused by the siting of the new U.S. missiles. That is, we confirmed our desire to reach agreement with concrete actions, which evoked a positive response in the world.

This is our unswerving principled policy. The USSR is sincerely striving for disarmament and nuclear arms reduction. Back in 1982 our country pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and urged other nuclear powers to follow our example. In 1983 the USSR announced a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of anti-satellite weapons in space for as long as other states acted the same way. Both these pledges remain in effect at the present time. We also proposed that the USSR and the U.S. reduce their strategic offensive arms by one-quarter and more. Yet, the U.S. Administration gave no constructive reply to any of these initiatives.

"Unfortunately, now, too, judging from the first stage of the Geneva negotiations, U.S. representatives have so far displayed no desire to reach agreement. Another thing is

evident: The U.S. is carrying on a reckless arms race and actively trying to project it into space.

"What is needed for a success in Geneva is reciprocal political good will for reaching agreement, given strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security. Despite a complex and tense situation in the world and difficulties in the negotiations in Geneva, we remain soberly optimistic.

"We hope that our partners will heed the voice of peoples who want peace and termination of the arms race. We hope that common sense, political realism, and the feeling of responsibility for a peaceful future will prevail. We have faith in the ability of peoples to safeguard their right to life.

"These days Soviet people mark widely the 40th anniversary of the great victory. They give due credit to the contribution of their Allies in the anti-Hitler coalition to the cause of utter defeat of the hated fascism. We remember the courageous French patriots, soldiers and resistance fighters who made a notable contribution to our common victory.

"In our firm conviction, no task is more important in the world today than to ward off the threat of nuclear annihilation of mankind. The more actively and resolutely members of the public work toward the solution of that task, the better are chances of success."

M.S. Gorbachev

The National Council of the French Republican Association of War Veterans and Victims sent messages to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, which emphasize that many members of that mass French organization fought against fascism shoulder to shoulder with Soviets and Americans during World War II. French war veterans expressed serious preoccupation about the arms race that has unfolded in the world. We realize, the message says, that a military conflict between the two powers would inevitably escalate into a nuclear one. This would have disastrous and irreparable consequences for all of mankind.

Welcoming agreement between the USSR and the U.S. on opening negotiations on nuclear and space arms, the authors of the message note that the joint Soviet-U.S. statement proclaims that the objective of these negotiations will be to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and at strengthening strategic stability.

The message underlines that the negotiations can proceed amid better conditions if research into and the beginning of militarization of outer space are stopped, since it would be illogical to conduct negotiations on preventing a new stage of the arms race and simultaneously begin that stage. They would be far more effective if the deployment of new missiles is terminated for the duration of the talks. This will make it possible to seek agreement in a healthier atmosphere.

In conclusion, the message expresses the wish for the Geneva negotiations to justify the hopes of the peoples.

CSO: 5200/1144

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

WEEKLY RADIO ROUNDTABLE VIEWS GENEVA, SHIP CALLS, SDI

LD211645 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 21 Apr 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with political observers Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin and Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Excerpt]

[Shishlin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, we should of course add to this that we want to have a serious attitude not only toward history, but to the present as well -- a present when there are quite a lot of alarming things, when there are also certain hopes, but when there is a continuing struggle for the same aims of freedom, democracy, and national independence for which the great battle against fascism was fought. So the celebration of the 40th anniversary of victory itself represents not only a tribute of grateful memory to those heroes who won the great fight, but also a sort of political point to ponder in the battle today to improve international relations and the world political climate, which is being waged persistently and consistently by our country, our friends and allies, broad peace-loving public forces and sober-minded political circles in the Western countries. In the world today there are truly many alarming things, but things which alarm are the first step toward understanding the need for action to put international relations on an even keel.

It is appropriate to talk about these questions because it is a fact that in international life the main problem has been and remains the problem of limiting and reducing the arms race and the destiny of those multifaceted efforts that are made on many levels by the socialist world and by us to limit and curtail the arms race. Recently, as everyone knows, the Soviet Union proposed a great number of initiatives, quite remarkable ones. Some of them have simply been taken unilaterally: in particular, this goes for the moratorium on stationing our medium-range nuclear weapons.

[Levin] I would like to recall, comrades, the essence of those initiatives. We are proposing that for the entire duration of the Geneva talks, the USSR and the United States place a moratorium on the creation, including scientific research work, and the testing and deployment of space strike weapons, and that they freeze their strategic offensive weapons. At the same time, the deployment of the U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and, correspondingly, the buildup of our countermeasures, would be stopped. We are ready to demonstrate goodwill, too, by specific action. To this end, the Soviet Union has announced a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the suspension of its other countermeasures being implemented in Europe. The moratorium

remains in force until this November. The decision that we make after that depends on whether the United States will follow our example, and whether or not it will stop the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe.

[Shishlin] Along the same lines was the recent reaction by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the proposal to place a moratorium on nuclear tests, a full moratorium: as we all know, only underground tests are permitted, while they have long been banned on land, at sea, and in the sky.

[Bovin] Here our U.S. partners at Geneva are again saying no to all our proposals of this kind.

[Shishlin] Yes, and so I have the question -- and maybe we can try to answer it among ourselves -- that if the United States reacts negatively to the Soviet initiatives and the Soviet unilateral action aimed at reducing tension, then are those initiatives justified, is that action justified?

[Bovin] Of course, the action is justified, because it draws the attention of public opinion to those very problems that can be resolved in the very shortest space of time. Take now, for example, the problem of reducing nuclear potentials: you can spend 1, 2 or 3 years working on it. But to freeze the current levels, for example, to put a ban on tests -- that could be done in just a few days, because the text of a treaty on nuclear tests had almost been completely prepared. The Americans then left the talks, and some 5 percent of the work was left uncompleted. But this could literally be done in a few weeks. That is why we are suggesting that this should be done. At the same time, however, there is a logic in their rejection of it. At Geneva they talk about disarmament, but at home they are engaged in rearming. And since they are making new missiles, since they are modernizing the warheads for those missiles, then they have to test them. That is their logic. The Pentagon is insisting that these tests be carried out, otherwise the brakes will be put on the modernization program.

[Shishlin] In asking that question, I deliberately wanted to reveal the problem that is facing us. In essence, the Soviet Union really does attach very great importance to Soviet-U.S. relations and strives to ensure that those relations return to a healthy course. But I would like to draw the attention of our listeners to the fact that the fate of world politics is decided not just within the framework of Soviet-U.S. relations. In the light of this, the unilateral Soviet action and the Soviet proposals aimed at achieving a sharp turnaround in the development of international relations are, of course, addressed to the world at large. I believe that the initiatives proposed by the Soviet Union are not limited by the American reaction in this respect. Essentially, we can state that in West Europe, and not only there, these initiatives have received both understanding and support.

[Bovin] This is, of course, a slightly more complicated issue, because the government circles of Western Europe in general aligned themselves with the Americans here. The NATO discipline has not been broken here, but the gradual increase in public pressure will affect policies of the governments, although it might not happen at once, perhaps, not as soon as we would like to see it happen, or as effectively, but it is still one of the most important factors in world politics now.

[Levin] It would suffice to mention that meeting of the Socialist International, for instance, where the socialist parties assumed quite a concrete stand toward Reagan's "star wars" program; they reject this initiative. The ominous nature of these plans

is evident. It is necessary to say that U.S. propaganda resorts to various inventions in its attempts to justify the "star wars" program. In his talk with the PRAVDA editor, Comrade Gorbachev described these arguments as fictitious. Indeed, they talk about defense while making preparations for an offensive, advertise the space shield while forging the space sword, promise to eliminate nuclear weapons while building them up and perfecting them in practice, give promises of stability to the world while working to upset the military balance. An understanding of the profound danger that is concealed in the "star wars" program leads to an increase in protests against these ominous plans.

Let's take another event that took place this week: The Government of Iceland's decision to not allow U.S. and British ships carrying nuclear weapons to enter the country's waters. A propos, such a question often arises here, and this question is contained in some letters we receive from our listeners: What can the antiwar movement achieve? They make speeches, the letters say, and organize demonstrations and meetings; but nevertheless, the NATO circles realize their militarist plans. However, the impact of the antiwar movement on the political atmosphere is quite strong. In particular, the decision by the Icelandic Government meets the demands of wide popular masses of not only that country, but of other Western European states as well, and when this decision is being analyzed in the West, it is noted that a similar decision has already been made by the Government of New Zealand. But there are also some differences between the positions of the Icelandic and New Zealand Governments. Iceland is a member of NATO.

[Bovin] On the other hand, New Zealand is also a member of the ANZUS group...

[Levin, interrupting] Yes, beyond any doubt, but...

[Bovin, interrupting] This is also a kind of NATO, with the only difference that it is small, for three states.

[Levin] This is exactly the case when it is a chip off the old block.

[Bovin] That is true. Besides that, the reason why the Americans were very unhappy with the decision of New Zealand then, is that they were afraid of exactly this effect of infection, so to speak, of the possibility that this fear would spread to other countries. We see the first results in Iceland.

[Shishlin] We cannot help evoking the memory of the fact that just last week the Norwegian Government drew a distinctive line quite clearly between its own approach to the Strategic Defense Initiative and the U.S. approach. Norwegians simply stated that they were not going to participate in the realization of this "star wars" plan.

[Levin] So, there are some shades of difference in the NATO discipline as well, after all. As long as we have touched upon this problem, we also cannot omit the fact that just this week, the issue of participation in realizing Reagan's strategic initiative was discussed in the West German Bundestag, where Chancellor Kohl made a speech. The position of the FRG Government on this issue is quite clear, and had also been presented before. To judge from the DPA reports, Kohl assumed the following stand: We, together with all West European states, are ready to take part in the realization of this program, this is necessary in order not to permit ourselves to fall behind in science and technology, and so on and so forth, but in general the FRG Government supports Reagan's program. This invites severe criticism on the part of the Social Democrats, on the part of the Greens, to say nothing about the Communists. This issue

attracted much attention during the visit of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to the Federal Republic of Germany. It was noted there that the questions of security are the basis of the further development of our relations. Of course, we have stated with satisfaction, for instance, that the FRG Government states its adherence to the Moscow treaty, to other treaties with socialist countries. This, beyond any doubt, is a positive factor and a pleasing phenomenon, but at the same time, we cannot ignore the fact that recently the level of FRG activity in support of U.S. military programs has grown considerably. U.S. policy toward its partners is expressed quite clearly; it is a policy of pressure. This policy of pressure reveals itself in even a more evident way; the pressure is not limited by any framework of normal international relations, when, let us put it this way, those governments that do not suit Washington are involved, that are not suitable according to the personal ideas of U.S. politicians.

CSO: 5200/1139

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CHINESE ENVOY TO UN ASKS PROGRESS IN U.S.-USSR ARMS TALKS

0W091100 Beijing XINHUA in English 1037 GMT 9 May 85

["Chinese Representative to U.N. Calls for Progress in U.S.-Soviet Arms Talks" -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] United Nations, May 8 (XINHUA) -- China once again expressed its hope today that the current arms control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union would achieve "substantial progress."

A statement to this effect was made by Ambassador Huang Jiahua, Chinese deputy permanent representative to the United Nations, at a meeting held by the U.N. Economic and Social Council to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War.

Calling on people to "draw good lessons for history, face the realities of today and arrange for a better future of humanity," the Chinese ambassador said that though no new world war had broken out in the 40 years or so, regional conflicts had been going on without a let-up. There was no tranquility in many parts of the world, and violations of the United Nations Charter and the basic norms guiding international relations occurred from time to time.

"The arms race between the superpowers, in particular, has made their stockpile of nuclear and conventional weapons reach alarming proportions, posing a grave threat to international peace and security," he stressed.

In safeguarding peace and striving to live in a peaceful environment, the Chinese ambassador said, the people of the world "are entitled to ask the two superpowers to carry out arms reduction in real earnest and show sincerity and good sense in so doing."

He recalled the Chinese people's hard struggle against fascism during the war and said the victory of the Chinese people "has a far-reaching significance in terminating imperialist enslavement and oppression and promoting the struggle of all the colonies and dependencies in the world for national independence and liberation."

He stated: "China is now engaged in its modernization program. The Chinese Government and people genuinely desire peace and have made this the primary objective of China's foreign policy. China consistently stands for disarmament. China favours the reduction of conventional arms and advocates the complete prohibition and total destruction of all nuclear weapons. We welcome the resumption of arms control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union and sincerely hope that their talks will achieve substantial progress."

"We are happy to note that in the world today, the forces against war are growing. We are therefore convinced that so long as all the peace-loving countries and peoples unite and work together, it would be entirely possible to avert another world war and there would be a bright future for the cause to safeguard world peace," he stressed.

He noted that at present, the desire of the developing countries to develop their own economies is another important global problem. It is a matter of regret to see that the developed countries have so far failed to make a positive response to this problem and a proper solution has yet to be found. "In fact, we should realize that the betterment of the economies of the poor countries will inevitably lead to a rapid expansion of international trade and world market, which in turn will benefit the developed countries," he said.

Calling for a new round of the North-South dialogue in order to make joint efforts to settle this issue, he said, "We also hope that the countries in the South will strengthen their cooperation in an effort to solve their own problems." "Today, more and more people have come to realize that the development of the Third World countries is an important factor for the growth of the peace forces in the world," he noted.

CSO: 5200/4036

SPACE ARMS

USSR: SDI PROGRAM SAID TO VIOLATE ABM TREATY

**General Abrahamson Refuted**

**LD252347 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 25 Apr 85**

**[Reshetnikov commentary]**

[Text] The United States is stepping up efforts to justify President Reagan's "star wars" program. The director of the Strategic Defense Initiative, as the project is officially designated, has claimed that it would not violate any current agreements with the Soviet Union. Our observer Yuriy Reshetnikov in his commentary discusses the issue:

Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, the official presently directing the effort, specifically referred to the Soviet-American Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty signed in Moscow in 1972. He told a Senate appropriations committee considering the SDI that the project would not violate the treaty currently in effect. The senators questioned the official on possible implications of the project and how it would affect American obligations under the ABM Treaty. First and foremost it should be noted that the ABM Treaty concluded almost 13 years ago is generally regarded as one of the most successful documents ever signed by our two countries. Not only has it effectively blocked the spread of a costly and potentially dangerous race in anti-ballistic systems, but also helped pave the way for a number of other agreements and negotiating forums.

There is no question that since the announcement of President Reagan's "star wars" program 2 years ago, the United States has embarked on a course to undermine the ABM Treaty. It is doubtful that Washington is unaware of the far-reaching effects that the implementation of the SDI would entail. In the first place it would upset the specific relationship between offensive and defensive arms and clearly jeopardize the prospects of limiting and reducing strategic weapons. Even the beginning of tests, let alone the deployment of space-based weaponry, would grossly violate the provisions of the ABM Treaty.

For the sake of the record, one of its provisions clearly states that each party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based.

The Pentagon, however, made it abundantly clear that it intends to waste no time forging ahead with the program. It was recently announced that it will deploy aboard the space shuttle the first such system in about 2 years' time, at least 2 years ahead of schedule, and as of 1987 such flights will be carried out at least twice a year.

The White House has already asked Congress for a large increase in research funds, up to \$3.8 billion in 1986 from the initial appropriation of \$1.4 billion, and that is by no means the limit. According to some expert opinion, the final bill could amount to as much as \$100 billion.

Squandering material and human resources, however, would not be the worst problem with the SDI. Far more perilous could be the ultimate result of such efforts, and contrary to what General Abrahamson has claimed, the immediate victim of the "star wars" program would be the only successful U.S.-Soviet arms accord still in effect, the ABM Treaty. And that is only the beginning, inevitably to be followed by an uncontrollable arms race in every conceivable direction. So, in a way, as one expert aptly remarked, proceeding with the "star wars" program would be like opening Pandora's box of retribution on unsuspecting mankind.

### Impact on Treaty, Geneva Talks

LD261500 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 26 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS -Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military news analyst, writes: The latest statements by officials of the U.S. Administration bear out the conclusion that Washington aims by no means at reaching agreement with the Soviet Union, but is out to revise the joint Soviet-American statement to the effect that the objective of the talks in Geneva will be to draw up effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth.

Thus, for example, Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, claimed in an interview with the ASSOCIATED PRESS agency that the sides at the talks were broadly discussing Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, thus presenting in a wrong light the course of the discussions at Geneva. Meanwhile, it is well-known that this programme of Washington, which provides for the deployment of a large-scale space-based anti-missile defence system, is in crying conflict with the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems in effect now and, certainly, was not and could not be a subject of bilateral discussions. The first stage of the talks covered not the U.S. "star wars" plan, but problems of preventing a militarisation of outer space. A special statement to this effect has been made, for that matter, by the Soviet delegation.

Adelman was trying to present the matter in such a way as if the American side was doing its utmost to "breathe life into the ABM treaty", albeit U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger quite recently described that treaty as a "pseudo-agreement on arms control", and his assistant Richard Perle openly insisted that the USA should refuse to observe its provisions.

It is clear even to uninformed people, that the American "star wars" programme and the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems are mutually exclusive.

The record of the U.S. delegation at the first stage of the talks is a source of concern for the world public. Washington has so far categorically refused to make any gesture of goodwill, which could be evaluated as its wish to attend practically to problems of limitation and reduction of arms.

Washington declares that the deployment of American first strike missiles "contributes to progress at the talks", and even summoned the head of the United States delegation in Geneva to push the MX missile programme through the Congress. While the Soviet Union

proclaims that arms race and disarmament talks are incompatible, Washington is continuing, with a persistance worthy of a better use, upholding its absurd contention that the sole reliable way to disarmament lies through a preliminary build-up of arms by the United States.

As is known, the Soviet Union has unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and build-up of other countermeasures in Europe. This decision has been evaluated world-wide as an important and constuctive one, contributing to the success of the talks. Yet, according to Washington's distorted logic, such a unilateral limitation of the USSR's military activity allegedly exacerbates differences at the talks.

The USA has rejected the Soviet proposal on the introduction by both sides for the whole period of the talks of a moratorium on the creation of space weapons, freeze of the strategic arsenals and medium-range nuclear weapons. Acting under far-fetched pretexts, the U.S. Administration refuses to follow the USSR's example and declare its commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Neither does the USA wish to follow the USSR's example and introduce a moratorium on anti-satellite weapons tests. Against the background of the obstructionist stand of the USA at Geneva, the statement by the same Adelman that the Soviet Union blocked progress at the first stage of the talks, sounds really ridiculous.

The Soviet Union believes that if the present stand of the USA is rectified, this would open up a possibility for the attainment of mutually acceptable agreements at Geneva.

Now, more than ever before, political will is needed in the name of peace on earth, in the name of a better future.

CSO: 5200/1134

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET DEFENSE MINISTER INTERVIEWED ON SDI, NUCLEAR PARITY

Text of Interview

PM070943 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 May 85 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Unnamed TASS correspondent interview with USSR Defense Minister S.L. Sokolov: "Answers of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, USSR Defense Minister, to TASS Correspondent's Questions" -- date and place not given.]

[Text] Question: Comrade Defense Minister, how do you assess claims by U.S. leaders that they are in favor of "safeguarding security on the basis of strategic defensive weapons" while the Soviet Union, they claim, is conducting a strategic offensive arms race?

Answer: The United States, which for the 40 years since World War II has been trying to achieve military superiority, has always acted as the initiator of the arms race. However, these attempts have been promptly thwarted by the Soviet Union's effective retaliatory actions.

The existing military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO is a historical gain of the socialist community and an essential condition of its security. It exists objectively today and, unless you resort to deceit, no one can refute that fact. The existence of equilibrium curbs U.S. imperial ambitions and prevents it from achieving world rule. That is why the Washington leaders are trying to break this parity and achieve military superiority over the USSR and its allies.

Under these conditions their statements concerning some kind of shift toward an orientation toward defensive weapons in questions of military building sound strange, to put it mildly. The facts prove that the present administration has no thought at all of "defense." On the contrary, it is counting on acquiring the potential for a first, disarming nuclear strike. For that, the precision of U.S. nuclear weapons capable of striking our retaliatory strike forces, above all, ICBM silo launchers, is being enhanced. Conditions are being created for a surprise nuclear attack with the aid of Pershing II missiles deployed in the West European countries and also long-range cruise missiles of various basing modes deployed close to USSR territory. Various means are being used to camouflage U.S. missiles and bombers in flight in order to restrict opportunities for detecting them as much as possible.

The Pentagon is rapidly developing new strategic offensive weapons -- two types of ICBM, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and two types of heavy bombers. Defense Secretary

C. Weinberger frankly states that, in creating a space-based ABM system, the United States will also have a "powerful strategic triad" to deliver a crushing nuclear strike jeopardizing the Soviet Union's existence. As we can see, it is by no means a case of an orientation toward defensive weapons but of the constant buildup of the U.S. strategic offensive potential.

The Pentagon is now rushing into space. What for? Once again to attempt to achieve military superiority over the USSR, through space this time. President R. Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" is only called "defensive" as camouflage, while it is in fact aimed at creating a new class of weapon, a space strike weapon.

In an attempt to take strike weapons into space, U.S. officials, counter to the facts, are claiming that the militarization of space began with the emergence of various military satellites and that the USSR has been conducting an arms race in space since then. That is not true. The satellites that both sides possess for communications, navigation, missile attack warning, and others are not strike space weapons. Right now neither the USSR nor the United States has weapons in space. The militarization of space so dangerous to mankind will begin when strike weapons designed to strike targets in space or from space are put into space. It is then that the space arms race will be unleashed, and that is precisely where the United States is leading matters.

The Soviet Union resolutely opposes the arms race on earth and its dissemination to space. Thus, it proposes the only sensible thing: freezing the sides' nuclear arsenals, halting preparation for the creation of weapons to deploy in space, and, on this basis, immediately moving to reductions of armaments stockpiles. To prove more persuasively its sincerity and goodwill, the USSR has stated that from 7 April through November 1985 it is unilaterally ceasing the further deployment of its medium-range missiles and is suspending the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe.

This decision confirms our country's desire to do everything to curb the arms race. It is an open road from a moratorium to a reduction. But, as is well known, the United States rejected the Soviet initiative out of hand, thus creating doubt on the sincerity of its statements that it is ready to agree on a nuclear arms reduction.

Washington officials are now making irresponsible statements to the effect that the moratorium announced by the USSR is not being observed. I will say frankly that this is deliberate and malicious misinformation. The USSR is true to its word; it is not increasing and will not increase its medium-range weapons in the European part of the country by a single missile or aircraft for the duration of the moratorium.

Question: The U.S. Administration claims that the adoption of the Soviet moratorium proposal would mean "the consolidation of the USSR's superiority" in the field of strategic offensive weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons. Does such superiority really exist today?

Answer: There is no "USSR nuclear superiority" in strategic offensive weapons or medium-range nuclear weapons. There is approximate parity with regard to these weapons. Washington is resorting to the distortion of facts in order to justify its unprecedented military programs and the arms race and to conceal its reluctance to reach agreement in Geneva on the nonmilitarization of space and a radical reduction of nuclear weapons.

The equilibrium between the USSR and the United States in the strategic arms field has been carefully verified and acknowledged by the sides during the drafting of the SALT I and SALT II accords. Right now the USSR has a few more delivery vehicles while the

United States has the advantage in terms of nuclear charges. But as a whole there is approximate parity.

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff confirm this approximate parity. Their report to Congress (1984) stated: "At present there exists approximate nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union." According to the official figures of the Washington administration itself, the USSR and the United States have an approximately equal number of warheads on ground-launched and sea-launched ballistic missiles. But the United States has far more heavy bombers than the USSR and correspondingly more nuclear charges on them. So if we are speaking of disparity [neraventsvo] in the field of nuclear charges on strategic delivery vehicles, then it is in the United States' favor.

In terms of medium-range nuclear weapons the NATO countries now have the advantage both in terms of delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft) and the number of nuclear charges lifted by these vehicles in one launching (the USSR has 850 vehicles and about 2,000 nuclear charges while NATO has 990 vehicles and over 3,000 nuclear charges).

How is Washington distorting reality? It is failing to count on the NATO side the British and French medium-range missiles and aircraft and the U.S. carrier-based aircraft (a total of nearly 450 delivery vehicles and nearly 1,500 nuclear charges). All the Soviet Union's weapons are counted, even those deployed in the eastern part of the country with no bearing on the balance of forces in Europe.

Those are the facts with regard to nuclear parity. Under these conditions the establishment of a moratorium on the sides' nuclear arsenals and on the creation of strike space armaments, including scientific research work, is a timely, effective, and correct measure from the viewpoint of curbing the arms race. It is totally in the spirit of the accord reached in January. This step would make it possible to prevent the deterioration of the situation and to embark on the solution of the question of reducing nuclear armaments.

Question: Washington leaders call the plans to create a space-based ABM system "humane." They claim that it would make ballistic missiles "unnecessary" and would rid mankind of nuclear weapons. What is the true meaning of the U.S. "star wars" plan?

Answer: Allegations concerning the "humaneness" of the U.S. space plans have been circulated to mislead the public and to distract its attention from these plans' danger to mankind.

What is Washington really planning? To create an ABM shield over the United States and, at the same time, to deploy first-strike strategic offensive armaments and new space-based strategic forces designed to strike targets on earth, at sea, in the atmosphere, and in space. It is not hard to see that, if these U.S. plans are realized, the Washington strategists might be tempted to use the space ABM shield as cover to risk using nuclear and space weapons for a strike against the Soviet Union and its allies, counting on impunity. According to the Pentagon's designs, the ABM shield is designed to thwart a retaliatory strike from the USSR and to "get," so to speak, in flight, the Soviet missiles which have survived a U.S. first nuclear strike.

In this connection the U.S. Administration's remarks concerning "delivering mankind from nuclear weapons" are outright demagoguery. If, as it assures us, "star wars" are the path to the elimination of nuclear weapons, then why is the United States building up strategic offensive arms on a huge scale, creating more and more new nuclear

facilities, deploying Pershings and cruise missiles in Europe, and engaging in the production of 17,000 new units of nuclear ammunition? Common sense suggests the need to freeze the sides' nuclear arsenals and go over to reductions. This is what the Soviet Union proposes.

People in Washington are acting in a different way. They say: Today it is necessary to continue to deploy strategic nuclear weapons; it is, moreover, necessary to militarize space and create a space-based anti-missile system, that is, offensive space strike weapons. And later, when all this has been done, "perhaps after many decades," it will, they say, be possible to reduce or even eliminate nuclear arms.

So it turns out that in order to eliminate nuclear weapons it is first necessary to multiply the stockpiles many times over. According to this logic, the path to nuclear disarmament lies only in the buildup of strategic offensive arms and the militarization of space, and will in any case take many decades. There can, supposedly be no other path.

Why are they doing this? In order to deceive people and distract their attention from the need for immediate and effective measures to reduce nuclear arsenals. Meanwhile, they carefully hide from the public the dangerous consequences of this course and conceal the interconnection that objectively exists between offensive and defensive arms, which is the basis of the unlimited-duration Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems of 1972. They keep quiet about the fact that the creation by one of the sides of a large-scale antimissile system breaks this interconnection, destabilizes the strategic situation, and forces the other side to restore the position either by building up its strategic offensive arms or supplementing them with antimissile systems, or, more likely, both.

In other words, the truth is that the space-based antimissile system which is being created by the United States programs an arms race in all salients and leads to the undermining of international security. This conclusion was clearly formulated by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his talks with a PRAVDA editor: "Just as the appearance of nuclear weapons did not eliminate conventional types of weapons, but only gave rise to an accelerated race for both nuclear and conventional arms, so the creation of space weapons will only have one result: The arms race will become even more intensive and will embrace new spheres."

From the military viewpoint the American "star wars" plan is an integral part of U.S. nuclear strategy, the first-strike strategy. The true purpose of this plan is to secure the conditions for permanent nuclear blackmail of the Soviet Union and other countries. In view of the fact that the United States categorically refuses to make a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, such intentions constitute a real threat to peace.

Question: The U.S. Government assures us that the "star wars" program is supposedly only a matter of scientific research, which is not banned by the 1972 ABM Treaty, and that the Soviet Union is supposedly engaged in similar research. What can you say about that?

Answer: The White House's assurances that as yet things are confined to harmless research can only mislead. The atom bomb was also a result of research, under the Manhattan project. Everyone knows how that ended for the population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Since then the world has been living under a nuclear threat. The "star wars" program involves even greater danger to mankind. It must be banned, and that includes scientific research work.

Washington's excuses about how "research" is permitted by the 1972 treaty are unconvincing. Article 5 of that treaty bans the development, testing, and deployment of space-based ABM systems or components. The so-called research taking place in the United States with the aim of creating an ABM system with space-based elements is already going beyond the bounds of scientific studies.

Certain experimental models of space strike weapons are being elaborated: various types of lasers, electromagnetic guns, interceptor missiles, and antisatellite systems. All these are components of an antimissile space defense, the "bricks to build the eventual system," as Keyworth, adviser to the President, put it. The research work to create these "bricks" is in direct contradiction to the 1972 treaty and must be stopped and banned.

The White House's assurances that after the completion of research work the United States could supposedly renounce the deployment of a large-scale space-based ABM system are not serious. It is difficult even to imagine that \$60 billion, the expenditure planned for scientific research work over 10 years, is necessary purely in order to resolve a theoretical question, whether or not it is possible to create space strike armaments. In a CBS interview on 13 January this year, C. Weinberger stated frankly: "I exclude the possibility of renouncing strategic defense either at the research or deployment stage." Commentary is superfluous.

Now for the question of space research in the Soviet Union. We do scientific research work, including work in the military sphere. This work is not aimed at creating space strike weapons, but is connected with improving space-based early warning, reconnaissance, communications, and navigation systems. We are not creating space strike weapons or an ABM defense of the country's territory. The USSR firmly adheres to the open-ended treaty of 1972.

Question: The American plans to create a space ABM system, as you have explained, are designed for the purposes of a nuclear strike with impunity against the Soviet Union. What might be the nature of the USSR countermeasure?

Answer: If the United States commences the militarization of space and thereby undermines the existing military-strategic equilibrium, the Soviet Union will be left with no choice but to adopt countermeasures to restore the situation.

This could be measures in the sphere of both defensive and offensive arms. It goes without saying that the USSR will choose the means of action that most accord with the interests of its defense capability, and not those toward which figures in Washington would like to incline it. I consider it necessary to stress quite definitely that our measures will be adequate to the threat which could be created to the Soviet Union and its allies.

The U.S. course of militarization of space will have an extremely negative effect on the military-political situation in the world and will make the resolution of the problem of nuclear arms reduction more difficult, if not impossible. The creation of space strike weapons will inevitably result in a lessening of security both for the United States itself and for its allies. The initiators of "star wars" and those who are inclined to complicity in this provocative program should not forget that outcome.

As we have repeatedly stated at the highest level, the Soviet Union does not seek to obtain any unilateral advantages over the United States and the NATO countries. We do not need that, since we have no intention of threatening them or imposing our own will on them, but want to live in peace with them and maintain normal, good relations. Our aim is to end the arms race and entirely eliminate nuclear weapons everywhere.

would like the United States to understand the Soviet stance at the Geneva talks and reciprocate. It must renounce attempts to impose on the Soviet Union an agreement that is unacceptable to it and that would leave the doors wide open for the implementation of Washington's planned military programs. "We propose to the U.S. Government," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, says, "that matters be conducted in such a way that it is clear to everyone, our peoples and other countries, that the policy courses of the USSR and the United States are oriented not toward enmity and confrontation, but toward the quest for mutual understanding and peaceful development."

#### State Department Response Criticized

LD071646 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 7 May 85

[ "Unsuccessful Attempts by 'Star Wars' Advocates" -- TASS headline ]

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The U.S. Department of State has made an unsuccessful attempt at "whitewashing" the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) or putting it in a simpler way, the "star wars" concept. A State Department spokesman, Edward Djerejian, at a press conference in Washington, commenting on the answers given by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Sokolov, minister of defense of the USSR, to questions of a TASS correspondent, chose a very simple way: He quite unfoundedly denied the impartial criticism of the U.S. Administration and, using the same "scientific" method, tried to advertise the "commodity" which is not only unnecessary but it really dangerous to the very existence of mankind.

First of all he stated that the real aim of the SDI is allegedly being distorted and that the SDI is ostensibly of "defensive" character and is designed only to provide an answer to the question of a possibility of creating a technology for a new stable basis for deterrence. This was a repetition of the selfsame Washington tale which is designed to lull the world public. The one who makes such statements deliberately ignores the objectively existing connection between offensive and defensive arms and seeks to conceal from the peoples Washington's true intentions: through militarization of outer space to make yet another attempt at upsetting the military-strategic balance of forces in its favour, to achieve superiority and to implement in practice the repeatedly proclaimed "position-of-strength" slogan. Pentagon spokesman are more outspoken.

Some time ago Edward Aldridge, under secretary of the Air Force, stated that one does not have to strain one's imagination to see that a nation controlling outer space can control the entire world. Colonel Jack Lousma, commander of the space shuttle Columbia, put it still more straightforwardly. He said that outer space is a place from where the whole world can be kept in fear. The SDI is a step not towards mutual security and reduction of arms but in the direction of pursuit for the creation of conditions for an "assured destruction" of the other side. As the British newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES has written, if a great power creates an anti-missile system, it will come to believe in its capability of delivering a nuclear strike without the danger of a retaliatory one. And this means that any attempt at providing oneself with a large-scale anti-missile system looks like an aggressive policy. It becomes increasingly difficult for Washington to conceal these true intentions behind the web of verbiage.

Another, worn-out "thesis" which was repeated by the State Department spokesman is that the SDI ostensibly envisages only "research". He went to the lengths of making a ridi-

culous assertion that the President's initiative does not envisage the development of weapons. Really, such an innocent, open-hearted and unknowing Department of State! It does not know that experimental specimens of space strike weapons are being tested in the United States: lasers of various types (including an X-ray laser powered by the energy of a nuclear explosion), electromagnetic guns, interceptor missiles, and anti-satellite systems. It would be useful for State Department spokesmen to read an article in NEW YORK MAGAZINE, [as received] which was signed by Max Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. It is directly stated in the article that some technical means for a large-scale anti-missile system already exist in the United States and could be practically deployed even now.

It will be not bad for them to acquaint themselves with a recent statement by presidential adviser George Keyworth that it would be possible to shorten a period for finding out technical feasibility of systems to intercept ballistic missiles in their launching phase ("exotic" systems) from five to three years.

The State Department spokesman tried to assert that the warning that the "star wars" programme poses a still greater danger to mankind than the "research" into the creation of an atomic bomb is allegedly "unfounded". Another totally unsubstantiated assertion. The creation of a new class of weapons -- space strike systems -- in addition to offensive nuclear systems -- increases the danger of a nuclear war many times over. If a war down here on earth is a catastrophe equation with many unknown quantities, the supplementation of it with a war in outer space and from space increases still more the number of unknown quantities of this fatal equation.

And, of course, the State Department spokesman failed to get away from Washington's cliches. He stated that the USSR allegedly possess both anti-satellite and anti-missile systems already, has created ground laser installations which are capable of destroying satellites, and so on and so forth. This confirms once again that Washington is aware of the futility of its attempts at justifying the "star wars" concept with peaceable phraseology and is moving on to a traditional method -- to laying the blame at somebody else's door. However, this method will not obviously bring the U.S. Administration any "dividends" either.

The entire world knows that the USSR's unilateral obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has been in effect since 1982. Its unilateral moratorium on being the first to launch anti-satellite weapons into space has been in effect since 1983. And its unilateral pledge to cease further deployment of its medium-range missiles and to cease the implementation of other reply measures in Europe has been in effect since April 7, 1985.

The Soviet Union firmly comes out against the arms race on earth and against its being spread over to outer space, and suggested the following natural and reasonable steps: to freeze the nuclear arsenals of the sides, to stop preparation for the creation of weapons for deployment in space, and on that basis immediately to move on to reductions in arms stockpiles. It is time for Washington, at last, to give up its prospectless attempts at achieving a military advantage, and to respond with reciprocity to the good initiatives of the USSR and to stop drawing the world into a senseless squandering of funds, the latest equipment and technology and scientific thought.

CSO: 5200/1145

SPACE ARMS

VELIKHOV CRITICIZES SDI CLAIMS, SPACE ARMS RACE

PM301818 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Apr 85 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov under the rubric "Protecting the Future":  
"Star Wars' Illusions"]

[Text] The plans for the creation of an ABM system with space-based components is one of today's most important and critical questions. This year of 1985 is a special year, a turning point for the destiny of peace, the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism.

Yet it is also the year of the 40th anniversary of the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki; it is 40 years since a qualitatively new weapon appeared that was many times more powerful than any people had ever had before. Mankind was faced with the question of how to carry on living in this world, in the new nuclear age. It was in 1946 that the USSR gave its reply, as the first to propose a complete ban on nuclear weapons for all time. Unfortunately, the United States categorically rejected the proposal. The logic of the decision was simple; it reckoned that by having a monopoly on nuclear weapons and by threatening to use them it would be able to dictate to the rest of the world.

Everyone remembers the subsequent stages of the U.S.-imposed nuclear arms race and knows where it led. In particular, to a considerable reduction in the security of the United States itself. It became just as vulnerable as the other countries. Analyzing these events in the light of history, one can state that when it refused to sign an agreement on a total nuclear weapons ban in 1946, the United States made a big political mistake. Had it agreed to our proposal then, it would be more secure now. This should have served as a very important lesson for the United States.

The state of affairs in the world today is such that if any type of weapon is allowed to be deployed in space, it can safely be said that it will be followed by a second and a third type.... This will inevitably mean the start of a qualitatively new arms race spiral, a space arms race. Again, as in 1946, it is necessary to erect a barrier, this time a barrier against placing weapons in space. Again, as in 1946, the initiator of the ban is the Soviet Union. Our proposals for this matter are well known. Recall that at the 39th UN General Assembly Session the Soviet Union submitted a proposal on the utilization of space exclusively for peaceful purposes. The United States was the only country not to vote for the resolution, adopted with active USSR participation, on "Prevention of an Arms Race in Space," which was supported by 150 countries. Thus the United States once again set itself up in opposition to the vast majority of the world community, including its allies.

There is still a chance that at least one area, outer space, will be left free of weapons. Soviet, and indeed the majority of U.S., scientists have been quick to draw the international public's attention to the tremendous potential danger posed by Washington's plans.

In this connection it is clear that the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments begun in Geneva are of special importance, their ultimate objective being to elaborate effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space, stopping it on earth, and limiting and reducing nuclear armaments. Of course, we will hope for favorable results at the talks. The arms race on earth cannot be stopped without blocking the dangerous plans to transfer it to space!

Representatives of the U.S. Administration and a number of bourgeois mass media organs are claiming and taking great pains to emphasize that the proposed "star wars" program is "defensive." But mankind cannot and must not forget the bitter lesson of history.

A group of scientists in various countries specifically carried out a detailed study of various aspects of the "star wars" program and explained them to the general public. They include our Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat (which has published a special report on this topic and issued numerous individual publications), the Federation of U.S. Scientists, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment, and others. Briefly summing up their conclusions, you can say that the plans for the creation of an absolutely impregnable ABM system with space-based components are an illusion not confirmed by any modern scientific or technical notions. The scientists' conclusions, based on profound knowledge of the fundamental laws of nature and a comprehensive assessment of the state of and prospects for the development of technology, rule out all variant readings and different interpretations. They are categorical and the arguments are conclusive.

In that case, then, do we need to worry about the destiny of mankind and the prospect of the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" plan? Unfortunately, concern is essential. The plan is an illusion, but it is an exceedingly dangerous illusion. It is dangerous precisely because the White House is claiming that the creation of space ABM systems is the road to nuclear disarmament and the lessening of the danger of nuclear war. In fact, however, the "Strategic Defense Initiative" considerably increases the danger of a nuclear conflict. This is because even the partial implementation of the "star wars" program would prompt the creation of its much more dangerous component, the first-strike weapon. We are talking in particular about the creation and deployment of an effective antisatellite weapon that would upset the existing strategic balance and act as a fillip to the further development of the arms race.

The second dangerous aspect is that any move in the direction of the creation of a global ABM system is a most gross violation of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, the cornerstone of subsequent arms limitation accords.

Third, the continuation of research and development in the "Strategic Defense Initiative" sphere effectively opens a "Pandora's box" and gives the green light to the development of a variety of weapons systems in space.

So who supports the exceedingly dangerous "star wars" plans? Above all the militarists, in their blind hatred of the Soviet Union, and the powerful military-industrial complex in the leading capitalist countries. This is understandable, since they can see the real, and very tempting, prospect of massive profits. The first \$26 billion, for projected "scientific research work," is just a small part of these enormous sums, but,

at the same time, it is the first step, setting in motion the massive flywheel of a new arms race spiral. That is why it is so important now, and I mean right now, to ensure:

the nonplacement of weapons in space;

the preservation of the principles and provisions of the 1972 ABM Treaty;

the prohibition of "research," testing, and development within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

Even if we assume that it will be possible to solve certain tricky (from the scientific and technical viewpoint) "defense" problems, the ABM system will turn out to be highly vulnerable to various countermeasures. The point is that there are always simpler and cheaper methods of overcoming the most sophisticated "defense systems." The creation of a space ABM system would quickly lead to the development of offensive means to overcome it. According to U.S. press data, the "accompanying" program, called a "countermeasures program," is already being devised in the United States.

Even if in 10 years' time, as a result of "scientific research" in the space ABM sphere, some practical results have been achieved (and we cannot believe that), by then sufficient scientific and technical potential will have been accumulated in the sphere of development of so-called defensive systems and the creation of new offensive facilities. Let us emphasize once again the main thesis. The space-based ABM system is an illusion, of course, but even the initial stages of development pose an enormous danger...

In the first place, the development of individual components of the space ABM system is exceedingly difficult to verify and monitor. Second, in a critical situation it would be difficult to depend on these components, for which absolute reliability would be a very important prerequisite. Finally, the individual components of the space ABM system are extremely vulnerable since they have parts that can easily be destroyed, thus crippling the whole system.

Does carrying out "scientific research" within the framework of the "star wars" program violate the 1972 treaty? Actually, the treaty says nothing directly about prohibiting scientific research, but it does envisage "prohibition of creation and tests." The United States is already carrying out tests, for example of X-ray lasers, at the Livermore laboratory in California. This has been reported in open U.S. publications. Thus, a provision of the 1972 ABM Treaty is already being violated. A U.S. Defense Department directive specifies for the 5-year period that the weapon components will be brought to the point where they ensure that the system is ready to be deployed. The flywheel of the massive U.S. military-industrial complex is beginning to spin, and it will be much more difficult to stop it later than it is now.

In "technical articles" appearing in the U.S. press we can read highly detailed and carefully devised "scenarios" for the deployment and use of space ABM systems. Generally speaking, it can be said that the United States has taken a line toward undermining the 1972 ABM Treaty of unlimited duration.

Effective antisatellite weapon systems are being developed within the ABM context, and this is a real threat to the existence of vitally important communications, verification, and monitoring satellites.

According to the U.S. Administration leaders' plans, the extensive space ABM system will perform "policing functions," enabling the United States to control the whole world. We

recall that the United States was harboring similar illusions in 1946. We also know what the result was....

So, an analysis of the plans for the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" once again leads to the conclusion that the only sensible and logical path is the one proposed by the Soviet Union, that is, the radical reduction and gradual destruction of nuclear and other armaments on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security. Only then can mankind actually be rid of the threat of nuclear destruction.

CSO: 5200/1128

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COSMONAUT SEES OFFENSIVE GOALS FOR SDI

PM111055 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Apr 85 First Edition p 5

[Article by USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut Georgiy Grechko under the rubric "We Will Defend the Future": "In Order That the Blue Band Does Not Disappear"]

[Text] Only a few years ago the paths of man's exploration of space excited only a narrow circle of specialists and us cosmonauts. And the population of the earth was increasingly widely enjoying the results of this work, while showing less and less interest in its substance.

We worked on earth and in space so that people on all continents could communicate by means of communications satellites. We built space bridges so that people all over the world could get to know each other better, trust each other, and share their best achievements in the sphere of culture, sport and science. Space was used to improve safety on sea and air routes.

After work we watched with a condescending smile naive movies in which likeable and noble heroes vanquished aggressors in World War II fascist helmets in "star wars." Good conquered evil in those fantastic fairytale parables.

But today the problems of utilizing space have migrated from the pages of journals known only to specialists to the front pages of newspapers all over the world. But this does not gladden us. It is not cinematic evil but real evil personified by the Reagan administration that has advanced the "strategic initiative" in space. As in an improbable nightmare the "star wars" have been transformed from a writers' fantasy into Pentagon plans posing a mortal danger to every person and all mankind as a whole.

A terrible threat from space--so dangerous that it has become the subject of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva along with the equally mortally dangerous nuclear missile threat--has come swiftly to hang over us.

The swiftness of this unexpected transformation still makes many people have doubts:

Are we not exaggerating the real danger of "star wars"?

Are we not starting to sound the alarm too early?

Do peace champions need to undertake anything at all, if talks are already being held?

It would seem that Reagan's "strategic initiative" is not dangerous, as it envisages the creation of an AMB /DEFENSE/ [capitalized word between slantlines printed in boldface] system with space-based elements. But this is a deception. The aggressor needs such a system in order to make a first strike and shelter from retribution behind an ABM space "umbrella." Otherwise the Reagan administration would have followed the Soviet Union's example in adopting a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, would not have deployed more and more first-strike missiles around the USSR, and would not have proclaimed in its military doctrine the possibility of winning a nuclear war.

All this put together leaves no doubt as to the extreme danger of Reagan's "star wars" for the USSR. And, in the event of these sinister plans being implemented, our country will be forced to take countermeasures. This will in turn to the lowering practically to zero of the threshold separating us from a nuclear missile catastrophe.

Indeed, when the U.S. and Soviet arsenals chiefly contained ICBM's, there were dozens of minutes between the time of launch (which could have happened, for example, because of a perfectly possible technical fault or by the will of some maniac) and the explosion which might have started mankind's last war. During that interval of time the possibility still remained of identifying the incident, giving warning of it, and, finally, shooting down the missile and holding the world back from the brink of catastrophe.

Now that medium-range missiles, cruise missiles, and submarines with nuclear weapons are deployed on combat duty near the borders of states, the time available to make decisions of vital importance to mankind has been reduced to a few minutes. This is catastrophically little.

If nuclear weapons are now to be deployed in near-earth space, they will thereby be brought to a distance of approximately 100 km not only from every continent or country but also from every city. The concepts of borders, front, and rear will vanish. Nuclear bombs and battle lasers--not fantasy ones--will hang suspended over everyone's head. Wars will not be something remote from us, taking people's lives somewhere on the shores of other seas known to us only on geographical globes. War will step onto the threshold of every home. And no one will be able to keep it off the threshold, for in practice no one any longer will have time during the remaining seconds to distinguish an accident from a planned attack.

But are we not getting concerned too soon, is the 21st century not a long way off, and is it not just scientific research work that is being envisaged now?

No, it is not too soon! Scientific research is just like the separate strokes on a painting. They can be applied to a still blank canvas, when no one knows what this painting will be. Unfortunately, scientific research in the sphere of "star wars" is like the last strokes on this terrifying picture. It is not questions of the possibility in principle of creating an ABM defense that are

being researched but how to implement it more efficiently, simply, and quickly. Research work is being carried out in the United States not on paper. Missiles are already being intercepted, and the latest antisatellite means are being tested in space. Aerial targets (for the time being just practice targets!) are already being shot down with laser weapons. Not millions but tens of billions of dollars have already been and are continuing to be allocated to this research.

But do we peace champions need to undertake anything now that official talks are being held in Geneva on all these questions? Perhaps they will settle everything without us?

I would like to have such confidence or, at least, hope. However, there are no grounds for calm. On the contrary, there are alarming facts. What is the Reagan administration undertaking against the background of the talks? Perhaps it has suspended the implementation of its plans and established a moratorium on them in order to prove the sincerity of its intentions with regard to the talks' aims? No. Not for a single day.

The talks are proceeding, but Reagan demands unconditional support for his "star wars" plans from the allies, and Japan offers him the latest technology to realize those plans.

The talks are proceeding, but Reagan is twisting the legislators' arms and, despite the campaign mounted by American peace champions, trying to secure appropriations for a further 21 MX first-strike missiles.

What, you might think, are a further 21 MX missiles by comparison with the hundreds of other missiles already in existence with thousands of nuclear warheads?

With every beautiful sunrise in space, like a rainbow in the sky, I saw the blue haze of the earth's atmosphere--the fine, very fine band between eternally black space and the black, nighttime earth. And now I understand very clearly that just 21 MX missiles, each with 10 warheads, are enough to poison the earth's atmosphere with radioactive fallout and to obscure it with smoke from thousands of conflagrations. The earth will be deprived of the sun's life-giving rays. A nuclear winter will ensure, which mankind will hardly survive. And yet these are the consequences of using just the 21 missiles for which appropriations have been approved in the United States during the Geneva talks.

The Reagan administration will continue to use these talks as a screen if we allow ourselves to be reassured by the very fact that talks are being held, and not by their positive outcome. We must exert an active influence on the course of the talks right now in order to prevent the start of the militarization of space. Tomorrow this process might become uncontrollable and irreversible. And then the day after tomorrow might not come for us at all. The blue band on the earth's atmosphere will disappear, and our blue planet will be transformed into a black, scorched, lifeless lump flying through black space.

CSO: 5200/1140

SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S.-FRG REPORT ON DIFFERENCES OVER SDI NOTED

LD070919 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 7 May 85

[Text] Brussels May 7 TASS -- TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

Serious differences between the United States and its West European NATO allies over Reagan's "Strategic Defence Initiative" are inevitable -- this is the conclusion that has been made in a joint report of American Congressman Robert Badham and Deputy of the West German Bundestag Peter Petersen, which has been distributed here. That document is to be submitted to the spring session of the North Atlantic Assembly due to be held in Stuttgart (FRG) on May 17-20.

The authors of the report note that the West Europeans fear serious negative consequences of their being drawn into preparations for "star wars". First, they note, scepticism prevails in European capitals as to the efficiency of the programme being built up by Washington. They feel concern that such a system might have negative consequences for stability in the world.

Second, they believe the stand of Western Europe is largely prompted by apprehensions that the drawing of NATO partners to Reagan's "Strategic Defence Initiative" might lead to violation of the provisions of the Soviet-American Treaty on Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. As is noted in the document, this is fraught with torpedoing the whole process of control over armaments.

Besides, write the authors of the report, the Europeans fear that even a limited participation in "star wars" preparations might lead to outflow of European scientists to the United States. The West Europeans believe that Washington could deceive them, by giving its allies not at all full but only a limited access to research, specifically in the spheres in which the United States lags behind Western Europe. As is shown by the experience of the past, it is noted in the document, the United States never strove to share results of its accomplishments in the sphere of technology with European allies and potential trade rivals.

CSO: 5200/1153

SPACE ARMS

**TASS ANALYST HITS WEINBERGER FOR CALLING SDI 'IRREVERSIBLE'**

LD141914 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 14 May 85

[**"USA: Policy of Militarizing Outer Space"--TASS headline]**

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Speaking in an interview with the newspaper WASHINGTON TIMES on Tuesday, Caspar Weinberger, United States secretary of defence, said that the USA would under no circumstances give up the implementation of its anti-missile defense programme with space-based elements and that it was "an irreversible." This statement by the Pentagon chief is apparently designed to disavow the claims recently made in the American press that President Reagan was ready to take a "flexible stance" on the issue of the "star wars" programme and that he was keeping that stance "secret" only to ensure a more successful holding of talks with the Soviet Union. Weinberger's statement shows that any Washington "flexibility" is out of the question and there is no "secret stance" of President Reagan.

Everything is absolutely clear: There is a "star wars" programme, i.e. a militarization of outer space, and it is being implemented in violation of the Soviet-American treaty in effect on anti-missile defence of 1972.

The U.S. Administration is making every effort to expedite its military space programmes for the use of outer space as a theatre of war. This is seen both from the sharp increase in appropriations on the "star wars" programme in the Pentagon's budget for 1986, which is now being examined in Congress and the official statements by persons carrying out President Reagan's decisions. Thus the budget for 1986 provides for an increase in appropriations on the anti-missile defence with space-based elements by 166 per cent as compared with the current year to reach 3.7 billion dollars. Within the next five years it is planned to spend 26 billion dollars on "star wars" preparations.

According to a statement by Lieutenant-General James Abrahamson, head of the organization for the implementation of the anti-missile defence with space-based elements programme, his department is planning to start already in 1987 the testing of equipment and arms on board a space shuttle. The point at issue, as we see, is the quite specific task of creating space-based strike weapons. Statements to this effect are also made, according to the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES, by Paul Nitze, adviser to the President Reagan on the arms reduction talks. He only wishes that these arms be "survivable", that is invulnerable to the enemy and cheap.

Thus the problem of Washington's "star wars" preparations reduces to a search to the possibility of launching the first strike, "guaranteed" from retaliation. That American concept includes as its part a militarization of outer space, which will inevitably lead to uncontrolled arms race in all directions.

In strictly observing the ABM Treaty of 1972, the Soviet Union does not create strike space weapons and an anti-missile defence of the country's territory. This stand of the USSR can serve as a constructive example to Washington for following the same line of renunciation of militarization of outer space. It must be noted that there is no fatal inevitability of a confrontation between the two countries.

CSO: 5200/1158

SPACE ARMS

THATCHER DISCUSSES SDI IN DER SPIEGEL INTERVIEW

Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 29 Apr 85 pp 127-142

[Interview with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher by DER SPIEGEL editors Johannes K. Engel, Valeska von Roques, and Joachim Hoelzgen in London--date not given]

[Excerpt] DER SPIEGEL: In Bonn, Mr Reagan will for the first time have an opportunity to use his persuasive powers to win over the other heads of government to his "star wars" program. You could give valuable advice to your European counterparts and the Japanese prime minister since obviously you have dealt with the matter in greater detail than the others. This is true, is it not?

Thatcher: I have concerned myself with it somewhat thoroughly, this is true, with respect to both the scientific and the political aspects.

DER SPIEGEL: You discussed it with the President at two meetings?

Thatcher: Yes.

DER SPIEGEL: Did his scientific advisers brief you on this subject?

Thatcher: Yes.

DER SPIEGEL: And afterwards you announced that you had received assurances that there would be negotiations before the systems would be produced and deployed. Was this the reason why you stated that you would fully support the research on the SDI program? Have we paraphrased you correctly?

Thatcher: I think that we must do research in any case because the Soviet Union also has explored a great deal already.

DER SPIEGEL: In this field?

Thatcher: Yes, definitely.

DER SPIEGEL: How do you know?

Thatcher: We know. They are fairly well ahead in laser and electron-beam guns. We know their work on the development of a new radar. We know--this is common knowledge--that they are capable of destroying satellites. We cannot do that.

DER SPIEGEL: They deny it.

Thatcher: They do not deny it at all. They do not deny that they have anti-satellite weapons. They have made good progress in the case of laser weapons and electron-beam guns and the new radar equipment. For many years they have had an ABM system, and they are modernizing it around Moscow. Surely you will not want to start denying it?

DER SPIEGEL: How can this be reconciled with the U.S. claim of a 10-year lead in the electronics field?

Thatcher: It is generally known that the Americans are ahead in computers. This is the usual field in which they are absolutely brilliant, as you know. To all of us it is very difficult to catch up with IBM and to keep in step with the pace with which they push their computer technology. We are doing quite a bit in that field, too. We have a large-scale publicly and privately funded program for getting ahead with the fifth generation computers.

DER SPIEGEL: Your arguments somehow remind us of the famous missile gap, the famous window of vulnerability.

Thatcher: Let me deal with that directly. Whenever there is a new weapon--be it the airplane or the V-2 rocket--it is but natural to try to develop a defense. Why in the world do some people say that it is wrong to fathom the option of developing a defense against the weapons having the greatest destructive potential. This makes no sense.

DER SPIEGEL: This sounds good, theoretically...

Thatcher: Enticing on principle, and fundamentally consoling for ordinary citizens, is the idea to actually try to develop a defense against the most devastating weapon in the world. What argument could be advanced against doing it? Many, many people in your country and in ours would be very glad to know that these weapons, should they ever be fired, could be intercepted while still in the skies and that they would thus be prevented from reaching the earth. I simply cannot follow a train of thought according to which it is possible to develop a defense for conventional weapons but that it is wrong to try to find a remedy against the world's most devastating weapon.

DER SPIEGEL: Even the Americans say that it is impossible to develop a defense system with 100 percent effectiveness.

Thatcher: One did not develop a 100-percent defense system against airplanes, either, but this did not keep up from developing the massive defense that has been built up--be it antiaircraft artillery or "Rapier" or "Roland" rockets. The fact that 100 percent cannot be attained does not necessarily prevent a person from trying to reach at least 95 percent.

DER SPIEGEL: But this would call in question the whole concept of our defense structure and -- at least temporarily -- create a dangerous imbalance. We are living with the mutually assured destruction, which alone is an absurd idea, of course...

Thatcher: I have never accepted this doctrine. What matters is not mutually assured destruction but damage to an intolerable degree. Neither we nor France with our independent deterrent force effect a completely assured destruction of the Soviet Union. What we say is that our independent deterrent force could cause intolerable damage, and that will hold true for some time to come.

DER SPIEGEL: If SDI disturbs the precarious balance of mutual threat which, after all, has preserved peace for the world...

Thatcher: But the balance has already been disturbed by the fact that the Soviet Union is doing research. You cannot check on research, and at the very moment one knows that somebody leads the way in research, one must do research as well. The agreement on antimissile missiles, the ABM Treaty signed by the United States and the Soviet Union in 1972 contains a clause which envisages the development of new weapons and prescribes certain procedures for that event. But research work is not prohibited for the very good reason that it is impossible to maintain precise surveillance on it.

Probably I need not tell you that science will make discoveries which will make everything possible that is conceivable. This is indeed why one tries to maintain a balance, and this is why it is necessary to negotiate with the opposite side if and when a defense system is ever set up. This is unequivocally prescribed by the ABM treaty.

DER SPIEGEL: Then you do not have any alternative but to continue? And if such large-scale development is done and so much money spent, then certainly pressure will be brought to bear on the next U.S. president in 1988 to have that introduced into production too. In any event, we know of no precedent in military history where a new weapons was developed which, having been developed, did not go into production as well; that was not the case even with the nerve gas. Is that not true?

Thatcher: But one negotiates because we find ourselves in a situation where both sides have developed a potential -- and just do not underrate the scientists in the Soviet Union. They were the first to send a human being into space.

DER SPIEGEL: Why is it, then, that they are so fearful? They seem to be genuinely afraid.

Thatcher: Do you believe that the Russians, should they be the first to have this whole thing, would really abandon it upon remonstrations by the United States? No. I believe what they would do is negotiate in keeping with the ABM treaty. I would like to say something else. I personally believe that chemical and biological weapons likewise must be counted among the world's most destructive weapons.

DER SPIEGEL: Why are so many people concerned about the whole "star wars" concept? Even your foreign secretary: Sir Geoffrey Howe, made a critical statement...

Thatcher: He held completely to my line.

DER SPIEGEL: He warned against building a Maginot line of the 21st century.

Thatcher: He warned against what?

DER SPIEGEL: Against building a new Maginot line.

Thatcher: I do not speak about the building of Maginot lines. I speak of it that one tries to achieve the best possible defense against the most horrible weapons of the world, and about it that both sides may possibly have that defense.

DER SPIEGEL: However, it looks as if there would be at first, only a 95-percent effective defense system for the United States against intercontinental missiles, and even there 5 percent would get through, as was admitted by the U.S. planners. For us it is most important that SDI would let Europe stand outside in the rain.

Thatcher: No, the U.S. President said that it would naturally also be available for Europe. There would be a shorter warning time, that is true.

DER SPIEGEL: In such a case, defense would be left completely up to the computers if only 60 seconds remained to decide....

Thatcher: You must also keep in mind that we are dealing with a world where not only the big powers have nuclear weapons. Maybe we will soon have to deal with a world where others will get nuclear arms. The only possibility of really defending against their weapons would be to quickly ask the computer. However, the computer would ward off an attack. It would not touch off an aggressive action itself. Defense is not based on offensive nuclear weapons, defense against nuclear weapons is not carried out by a nuclear weapons.

DER SPIEGEL: We realize that.

Thatcher: Then I fail to understand what makes you so terribly concerned. It is clear to me that one could get an imbalance and, therefore, I say that one must negotiate on the deployment, there is no doubt about it.

I do not believe that one will ever have a 100-percent effective defense system, and for this reason we will maintain our nuclear deterrence force. We have only a small deterrence potential, maybe 2.5-3 percent of what the Soviet Union has, but even a small number is still enough to cause unacceptable damage.

DER SPIEGEL: Then the French force de frappe and your nuclear submarines with Trident 2 missiles would be outdated?

Thatcher: Not for a very, very long time. I remember how I was asked in the House of Commons on the afternoon after the interception experiment when, as you know, the interceptive missile had hit and destroyed the attacking dummy: "Is Trident not outdated now?" As if one test meant that the whole technology was available now. It will last for a long time until the technology is completed.

DER SPIEGEL: So you are still convinced that President Reagan wants only research work to be done and that he is not out to have fireworks produced, too?

Thatcher: The President has told me and he has also said in a common statement with me that if deployment were to take place, there would be negotiations according to the ABM treaty.

DER SPIEGEL: So you fully support his line?

Thatcher: On this point, we are both on the same line.

DER SPIEGEL: The French have suggested that the Europeans should perform their own civilian research work in this field. Do you think that this would be a good idea?

Thatcher: I thought that they had suggested to coordinate our efforts if we were to take up our own research work upon the U.S. invitation. I very much doubt that we would be in a position to use the fantastic figure of scientific resources for this work as the Americans do. It does not seem advisable to me to duplicate the efforts. After all, we are allies. There must be no nonsense here. We are not nonaligned, we are not neutral, we are part of the defense of the free world, and we are allies.

DER SPIEGEL: However, we are unequal allies, some are more equal than the others because they have nuclear weapons and worldwide power, as the United States and the Soviet Union.

Thatcher: Yes, indeed.

DER SPIEGEL: Our foreign minister had asked the Europeans to concentrate their technological forces in order to be able to talk to the Americans as equals, and not to be just suppliers to U.S. industry. Is that not a sensible proposal?

Thatcher: It is a possible proposal. However, I would not absolutely agree that we with our research efforts, in complement with yours, would be only suppliers to U.S. industry. We have some excellent scientists, just as you and France do.

DER SPIEGEL: Our experience is sad.

Thatcher: When I went overseas to visit NASA and to see the Gemini program, it turned out that the chief came from my election district and that he is now working with the Space Shuttle program. We have quite a lot of people who are very good in the fields of communications and software. I hope that our scientists are in demand in the United States. After all, our people went over there during the war to work on the development of nuclear weapons. We have a long common history of research cooperation.

DER SPIEGEL: Bilateral technological cooperation with the United States has been a sad story for us. We invested a lot of money in the Spacelab program, and we received almost nothing for it.

Thatcher: But you certainly carried out some of your own experiments in spacelab?

DER SPIEGEL: Very few. Therefore, the chancellor is urged in our country to adopt a harder attitude.

Thatcher: May I say the following: I do not think that we would help anybody by trying to separate the United States from Europe, or by separating one of our countries from the United States. In all discussions I have ever had with the Soviet Union, I have always clearly said: "Do not waste your time with the attempt to separate me from the United States! We are the Western alliance and it is senseless to try to split us up, because you will not be successful in doing it."

DER SPIEGEL: The Russians understand this very well. When we spoke to them in Moscow, they often began with the introduction: "Naturally, we do not want to try to separate you from the Americans..."

Thatcher: Whereupon they promptly try to do exactly that.

DER SPIEGEL: That depends. Mrs Thatcher, with a view to East-West relations, you are in an outstanding position because you have talked to Mr Reagan about "star wars" and to Mr Gorbachev. What was your impression? Was he really frightened by this development, because he threatened to disrupt the Geneva talks if Mr Reagan...

Thatcher: Why do you use the word "frightened"? I do not believe that Mr Gorbachev is afraid of anything. He knows very well that in some fields the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States, for instance, with regard to the ability to destroy satellites, and I also believe with regard to laser guns and electronic beam guns -- at any rate, it was during one phase. I do not know exactly in how far the United States has caught up. He knows that a commitment exists to negotiate on deployment, and that this commitment will give him indeed a mechanism to exert influence on the deployment. Do not forget that the "Galosh" missile defense system around Moscow is already rather effective.

DER SPIEGEL: It is an antiquated system.

Thatcher: Yes, but it is being modernized! Mr Gorbachev is not frightened by anything. He would say to himself that if this is the next generation of weapons development, we must naturally take part in it.

DER SPIEGEL: Should the West not take his threat seriously that he would let the Geneva negotiations fail?

Thatcher: The threat to leave Geneva has not yet been uttered. In fact, they have taken part in the first negotiation round through to the end, and I think that after an acceptable break they will return.

DER SPIEGEL: You once said that Mr Gorbachev is a man with whom you could do business. What did you mean to say: that he is a sober-minded and realistic man, a man who can be trusted?

Thatcher: He is extremely well informed and this is why one can talk with him, on matters in general as well as in detail. He does not do what is done by so many Soviet leaders -- that is to read from a typewritten document. He is very well informed about everything. I myself, too, am very well informed -- I hope so at least -- I have already attached value to it and therefore we are getting along well, of course; he knows what is going on, I know what is going on and this is why both of us understand what we are telling each other.

DER SPIEGEL: Can you discuss with him laser rays, fast particles, and other "star wars" finesses?

Thatcher: Yes, I can, but you do not have to know all the details to be able to discuss these matters. As you know, Gorbachev has considerable scientific experiences gained in the field of agriculture. One only has to push forward to the vital points. He obviously is a very self-confident man and a person who is also ready to engage in a debate, a discussion, and a combative dispute. I can always do business with a man like him. I am absolutely aware as to when he lapses into propaganda.

DER SPIEGEL: You are aware as to when he is talking propaganda and he knows that you know it.

Thatcher: Yes, this is correct. I had a very long talk that went into great detail. He responded to my arguments and I responded to his arguments. Someone like him can be dealt with professionally. I do not see communism through rose-colored glasses. Likewise, he does not see us through rose-colored glasses.

DER SPIEGEL: He has suggested regular meetings on the highest level between the Soviet Union and the United States. Do you think that such meetings with a man such as Gorbachev would be a reasonable idea?

Thatcher: I certainly do not have any objections against it if it helps to achieve something. However, normally it is something that is needed only if one got stuck in other negotiations. Then a high-level meeting may be needed so as to achieve a breakthrough. However, this is done, in my view, only on very rare occasions because it produces two equivalent but totally opposite things: that is either an increased feeling of crisis or exaggerated expectations, both of which actually are not desired.

CSO: 5240/14

SPACE ARMS

FRG OFFICIAL 'REGRETS' GORBACHEV'S ARMS INCREASE THREAT

LD270658 Hamburg DPA in German 0014 GMT 27 Apr 85

[Excerpt] Osnabrueck, 27 Apr (DPA) -- According to Foreign Ministry Minister of State Alois Mertes (CDU), the Federal Government regrets that new Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev has threatened strengthened nuclear weapons in response to the American preparations for a missile defense system in space (SDI). Mertes said in a conversation with NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG (Saturday's edition) that intimidation campaigns of this type serve neither Western cooperation with the Soviet Union, nor "genuine detente and balanced disarmament." The Federal Government held to its positive assessment of SDI.

The Federal Government does not share Gorbachev's assertion that the danger of war has increased by research into this defensive system. "Neither Washington, nor Moscow nor other capitals of the Warsaw Pact and NATO states are ruled by suicidal people," Mertes said.

CSO: 5200/2607

SPACE ARMS

BELGIAN COMMENTARY ON 'CHOICE' BETWEEN EUREKA, SDI

PM231507 Brussels LE SOIR in French 20-21 Apr 85 pp 1, 3

[Commentary by Guy Duplat: "'Star Wars' or Eureka?: Europe Must Decide on Its 21st Century"]

[Text] "Star wars" has set Europeans' minds spinning. They do not want to miss the boat when it comes to 21st-century technologies. The United States proclaimed that the race was on when it announced the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. Nobody knows whether the project will succeed, but it will certainly cost a fortune (a figure of \$500 billion is being mentioned). President Reagan is inviting the Europeans, Japanese, Australians, and Israelis to take part in it. And the Europeans are hesitating. This research could certainly produce the discoveries and industries of tomorrow. But is the only choice between abandoning the race and throwing oneself into a military project over which the United States will maintain its leadership?

France's Eureka proposal, formulated in Paris Wednesday, seems to offer another solution. This would be to create, with any European nations which desire, a "high-technology Europe" that would take up the SDI scientific ambitions, perhaps with civilian but certainly with more European objectives. This will be discussed next Monday and Tuesday in Bonn at the summit of WEU defense and foreign ministers and the following week in Brussels at a meeting of the Ten's foreign ministers.

Eureka remains a vague project, but it will shuffle the cards and force the Europeans to define the strategy more precisely. In a letter to the Twelve, Paris proposes a joint research program in several strategic fields such as lasers, particle beams, optical electronics, new materials, biotechnology, artificial intelligence, and microelectronics. There is a striking similarity between this program and the "star wars" program. In this respect Eureka could be a response to the SDI research program, but it could also form the basis for European cooperation with this program. The main support for France's plan seems to come from the FRG.

We could thus see the formation around the Paris-Bonn axis of a hard core of European countries prepared to make a major effort in vanguard technologies. Eureka would then constitute a step toward a scientific Europe with two levels. Be that as it may, the French proposal seems to be in line with the proposals that European Commission President Delors made before the recent European summit in Brussels. He proposed doubling the European research budget by 1989 in order, he said, to respond to the SDI. The British did not accept the idea, but Eureka now revives it, at least for the countries which accept it.

One authoritative French source commented Thursday that Mr Mitterrand's initiative in fact fitted both bills -- civilian and military -- with regard to the present technological acceleration. According to this source, it means seeking with our European partners, not just within the EEC, ways of jointly mobilizing our capacity for investments with a view to strengthening Europe's "strategic independence" in the industrial field. The United States, it was pointed out, is preparing to invest the prodigious sum of \$26 billion in the SDI, and its research and development budget is already double the EEC's.

Eureka as yet lacks any definite structure or specific means of financing, and no timetable has been set for the establishment of this policy of technological coordination. According to its promoters, it is a matter of examining with the countries concerned an institutional formula and means of financing within the framework of a "variable geography" approach.

France's Research and Technology Minister Hubert Curien spoke out Thursday against the creation of a European technology agency, which could appear to some as a structure rapidly dominated by the wealthiest countries (particularly France and the FRG) and could discourage countries anxious for budgetary savings, such as the UK. According to Mr Curien, it is necessary to establish a "system of networks, of communicating vessels between the laboratories of several countries working on jointly agreed upon subjects."

Eureka poses two questions. Is there an alternative to a military project? And is there an alternative to cooperation with the United States?

The SDI project is clearly military, as shown by the character of some of its most eager advocates (such as the father of the H-bomb, that Dr Strangelove, Edward Teller). But the United States is proposing that we participate in a research program, not in future deployment of new weapons. In any case the dividing line between military and civilian research is highly artificial, as shown by the example of nuclear energy or, as Mr Martens pointed out to parliament, the fact that laser research has applications in eye surgery.

Conversely, even if the Eureka project were apparently more civilian than the SDI, it would also have obvious military repercussions. It is the usual philosophical debate on the distinction between essentially "useful and good" scientific research and applications which can be "good" or "bad." Research and technology are always "dual." Nevertheless, if Belgium were to participate in the SDI it would be the first time our scientific policy had directly subsidized military or paramilitary objectives.

Such a debate does not really seem to have begun yet in Belgium, or even within the EEC. Why introduce a new project instead of further subsidizing existing projects (ESPRIT, RACE, JET, ESA, CERN) which are already involved in the high technology sector? At the moment there is hardly any answer to this kind of question other than the "necessity" to respond to the race announced by Washington.

The second issue raised by Eureka is of course European independence. The same debate has confronted the European Space Agency. The United States offered it participation in its future orbital station. Europe accepted but at the same time is to develop its own means for occupying space.

Are Europe's industries not simply subcontractors of the U.S. main contractor? Will technology transfers not be in one direction only, from Europe to the United States? Do we not risk losing our technological independence even before our political independence? Such anxieties are felt not only in Paris but also in Bonn. Of course FRG industry is eager for technology contracts, but if it can secure a European equivalent to U.S. offers it could only find that advantageous.

So the stakes in the present debate are crucial. They are Europe's scientific and political independence. But how can they best be guaranteed? Nobody yet seems to have a clear understanding of the technological aspects of the issue, and there is a danger of decisions being made purely according to political alignments, irrespective of the technological issues.

CSO: 5200/2592

SPACE ARMS

NORWAY 'TACITLY' REJECTS SDI PARTICIPATION OFFER

AU181645 Paris AFP in English 1636 GMT 18 Apr 85

[Text] Oslo, April 18 (AFP)--Norway has tacitly turned down the United States' offer to participate in the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), saying the so-called "star wars" program could lead to "an extension of the arms race into space."

In a letter to the Parliamentary Committee of Foreign Relations published here Wednesday, State Secretary of Foreign Affairs Torbjorn Froeysnes voiced "great concern (should) the allocation of enormous resources to this field of research establish a technological basis for an extension of the arms race into space." The letter comes after repeated calls from U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger for North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) nations to join the space-based antimissile research. Norway is a NATO member.

"Norway expects this research not to reach proportions nor take directions that could justify the impression that the United States is seeking strategic superiority," Mr Frøeysnes said.

Earlier today, Chancellor Helmut Kohl of West Germany confirmed Bonn's backing for SDI but said his country would respond to the offer to take part in research on its own timetable. No NATO members have officially committed themselves to the program since Mr Weinberger last March 26 first called for NATO cooperation.

CSO: 5200/2592

SPACE ARMS

DANISH FOLKETING IN DEBATE OVER 'STAR WARS' STANCE

PM171200 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 13 Apr 85 p 1

[Ole Dall report: "New Footnote Conflict"]

[Excerpt] A new political battle in the Folketing over Danish security policy is now in the offing after the Social Democratic Party yesterday requested a debate on Denmark's attitude to the U.S. "star wars" project.

The Social Democrats, the Socialist People's Party, the Left Socialists and the Radical Liberals are most dissatisfied that at the NATO ministerial meeting 26 and 27 March Defense Minister Hans Engell (Conservative Party) did not make clear Danish opposition to the space defense system in a so-called "footnote" to the joint communique. The four parties point out that on 26 March the Folketing passed a motion opposing space, weapons and "research into and the development of them."

After a meeting of the Folketing Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday Prime Minister Poul Schlueter said: "We have informed our NATO partners of the Folketing motion, but we did not think that its contents were such that it was necessary to add a 'footnote.' We should have as few of these as possible."

CSO: 5200/2592

SPACE ARMS

FORMER NORWEGIAN LABOR PARTY LEADER COMMENTS ON SDI

PM241515 Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET in Norwegian 20 Apr 85 p 17

[Former Labor Party chairman Reiulf Steen "commentary": "All-Out War Over Star Wars"]

[Text] What is the background to and the real reason for Ronald Reagan's plans to set in motion a research program for the militarization of outer space, the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]? As the majority of people interested in this issue already know, this is not a new idea.

More than 30 years ago it was proposed that a weapons system -- ABM -- be developed which would be able to defend the United States against strategic nuclear arms. Past presidents rejected the proposals as economically irresponsible, unrealistic in defense respects and also likely to trigger off new rounds in the nuclear arms spiral.

It was President Nixon, certainly no dove, who, in 1972, with the support of Congress created the opportunity with the Soviet Union for the so-called ABM treaty in which both sides renounced further development of such weapons systems.

Once again: Regardless of what you may think of Richard Nixon, this agreement, which those with the greatest insight regard as one of the two most important steps (the test ban treaty is the other) toward limiting the nuclear arms buildup, can safely be described as one of the most important results achieved by an president in the work of making the earth a little safer.

In a few sentences in a speech which he gave 23 March 1983 and which came as a total surprise to even his closest aides Ronald Reagan not only endangered the ABM treaty but -- and this is even more staggering -- he also reversed a main element in U.S. nuclear policy and in NATO strategy, namely that of the doctrine of deterrence.

As is well known, Western strategy has been based on the thesis of deterrence. This thesis has often be questioned. German Social Democrats have done so, the European peace movement has done so, the Norwegian Labor Party has done so, prominent Americans such as George F. Kennan, George W. Ball and others have done so. But is it likely that President Ronald Reagan now suddenly agrees with the European peace movement, German Social Democrats and the Norwegian Labor Party? Nothing would please me more, but I do not think it likely!

Unfortunately it is necessary to ask a different and much more worrying question: Is the SDI not simply founded on the President's lack of faith in negotiations as a means

to achieve agreements on mutual, balanced and verified disarmament? It is a regrettable, but unfortunately indisputable fact that Ronald Reagan has on several occasions said that he does not believe in negotiations. To put it in his own words: "How can you negotiate between good and evil? How can you negotiate with people who say that they do not believe in God?" Since long before he became President he has also been an opponent not only of the ABM treaty, but of all agreements on arms control between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This is the background to the following description by former U.S. Under Secretary of State George W. Ball of the speech Ronald Reagan delivered 23 March 1983: "...one of the most irresponsible acts by any head of state in modern times." THE NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS, 11 April 1985.

It is astounding that these key political questions have not been commented on in detail in the Norwegian debate on SDI. For me, this is the most important consideration, because, for example, SDI could lead to the most dramatic break we have seen in the broad strategy on which there has been broad agreement: negotiations which could lead to agreements on mutual and verified disarmament. Nor have we to any great extent discussed the fundamentally new situation in which Europe will be placed if the SDI plans are realized.

Why has it proved so impossible for Norway's foreign policy and Armed Forces' leadership to discover what was discovered by [Norwegian Foreign Minister] Svenn Stray's Conservative counterpart in Britain, Geoffrey Howe, among others?

Now I see that [Prime Minister] Kare Willoch has been in Larvik and has repeated the argument that the Soviet Union has already set in motion its program for the development of a corresponding system in space. Reagan's "star wars" is presented almost as a response to a Soviet provocation. But this is not correct and I am concerned that the prime minister has been misinformed on this point.

CSO: 5200/2592

## DUMAS REJECTS SDI 'SUBCONTRACTOR' ROLE

AU101851 Paris AFP in English 1828 GMT 10 May 85

[Text] Limoges, France, May 10 (AFP) -- Europe will not be an area with an economy "subcontracted to the U.S. economy," French External Relations Minister Roland Dumas said here today. He was referring to the deadlocked summit of seven leading non-communist industrialised nations in Bonn last weekend -- mainly over a clash between France and the United States concerning European participation in U.S. space defence research and over a new round of international trade talks. Mr. Dumas acknowledged that everything had not worked smoothly on the European side.

He also said that West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl "turned away from the path of Europe because he was anxious to give a good welcome to Mr Reagan" who arrived back in the United States today from a 10-day tour of Europe. But Mr. Dumas declared: "France is taking, and will take, the lead in the economic recovery of Europe. France will put all its good will behind this, and will prove it in the weeks and months to come."

He then revealed that President Reagan had said clearly to Mr. Mitterrand in private talks in Bonn that the "United States would give European countries some sub-contracting contracts" for the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), popularly known as the "star wars" programme.

Mr. Dumas declared: "The reply at the very least is that we are not in a hurry to rush along this route which is being offered to us." The minister, who was opening a trade fair in this southwestern town, said that France "will do everything to help the movement for European recovery to pick up momentum in the right direction."

In this context, France had proposed in Bonn a move "in a new and modern direction" with the Eureka project, he said. Eureka is a France-German proposal to concentrate and coordinate research in a high technology agency within the European Economic Community (EEC).

CSO: 5200/2615

SPACE ARMS

HUNGARIAN DAILY REPORTS SOKOLOV TASS INTERVIEW

AU070850 [Editorial Report] Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian on 6 May 1985 on page 2 carries a 720-word unattributed report on Soviet Defense Minister Sergey Sokolov's answers to questions put by the TASS correspondent, headlined: "The Soviet Union Will Not Allow the Militarization of Space To Upset the Strategic Balance--Defense Minister Sergey Sokolov on 'Star War' Plans."

Commenting on the strategic defense plans put forward by Washington, Marshal Sokolov says that "They do not think of defense at all in Washington but they want to acquire the capacity for a first disarming nuclear strike" to destroy the Soviet counterstrike capacities, and that is why the Pentagon "continues at high speed the development of new strategic attack weapons"; and the star war plans initiated by Reagan "are called defensive only to cover the essential thing that they are in fact plans for the creation of new class weapons."

Sokolov continues by pointing out that both the Soviet Union and the United States have satellites of different kinds stationed in orbit but these are not nuclear weapons of attack, and the militarization of space will start when attack weapons are stationed in space.

On the moratorium proposed by the Soviet Union, Sokolov stressed that "Moscow keeps its word and is not increasing its intermediate-range weapons stationed in the European part of its territory by a single plane or missile in the period of the moratorium."

Sokolov is reported as condemning the U.S. experiments and the attempt to present them in the light "of some sort of scientific experiment that would not be banned by the 1972 Salt Agreement." The Soviet Union is also carrying out scientific research activity in space, he is reported as saying, "among other things in military areas, too, but is is not directed at the creation of attacking space weapons" but deals with the perfection of already existing early warning, communications, and navigation systems.

In conclusion, on the issue of possible Soviet countermeasures, the defense minister stressed that the Soviet Union "will be forced to institute countermeasures if the United States begins the militarization of space and thus upsets the existing military-strategic balance," and that "our measures will be proportionate to the threat with which the Soviet Union and its allies is faced." No further processing planned.

SPACE ARMS

CANBERRA DETERMINED NOT TO ENDORSE SDI

Foreign Ministry Official Briefs Parliament

BK130912 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 13 May 85

[Text] An American technical mission is expected in Australia late this month to explain the United States' Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI], also known as "star wars." Radio Australia's Canberra correspondent, Walter Hamilton, says although Australia is to get a detailed explanation of the space-based antimissile defense system, it is holding fast to a decision not to endorse the plan and is unlikely to accept an invitation to take part in research.

Hamilton says the deputy secretary of the Foreign Affairs Department, Mr Duncan Campbell, told the parliament subcommittee on disarmament and arms control today that there was a series of very difficult contradictions involved in the defense system. However, Mr Campbell said that as the debate on the "star wars" system continued in the United States, support for it was probably increasing. He told a hearing in Canberra that it was the government's view that the present system of nuclear deterrence which would be undercut by the SDI was the only appropriate way of approaching disarmament and arms control.

Satellite Testing Decried

BK100900 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 10 May 85

[Text] The Australian Democrats have condemned the government's decision to assist the United States in testing a new satellite surveillance system. Australia's participation in the program was confirmed earlier today by the defense minister, Mr Beazley. The minister said that although the satellite system was associated with the so-called American "star wars" plan to base weapons in space, Australia's part would not be directly linked with "star wars."

The Democrats' spokesman on defense, Senator Mason, said the research was an essential part of the "star wars" system and the government was guilty of hypocrisy in agreeing to participate in the testing.

CSO: 5200/4320

SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

TASS ON U.S. MILITARY ROCKETS--Washington, 8 May (TASS)--U.S. Under Secretary of the Air Force Aldridge has announced the beginning of work on the creation of special heavy rocket carriers for the needs of the U.S. Air Force's space programs. Speaking at one of the subcommittees of the Senate Allocations Committee, he stated that it is proposed to entrust fulfillment of the \$1.68-billion contract to the "Martin-Marietta" aerospace concern, which will build a new variant of the "Titan" rocket system. At the same time the Air Force request for the 1986 fiscal year speaks of the continuation of work on building a unified space operations center that will unite the functions of control over military satellites and manned flights in the "Shuttle" program being carried out for military purposes. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0610 GMT 8 May 85]

TURKEY PROMISES TO HELP SDI--Ankara--National Defense Minister Zeki Yavuzturk, who visited the United States at the official invitation of U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, stated that Turkey has informed Washington of its intention to contribute to the project known as "star wars." Turkey's contribution will pertain more to the "construction" [yapim sahasi] Yavuzturk added. He also noted that European countries are worried that this project will "accelerate tension between the United States and the Soviet Union." [Excerpts] [NC151251 Istanbul CUMHURIYET in Turkish 10 May 85 pp 1, 11]

AUSTRALIAN MINISTER ON INFRARED SENSING --The minister for defense, Mr Beazley, has confirmed that Australia will help test a new United States satellite system codenamed Teal Ruby and associated with the space weapons system known as "star wars." But Mr Beazley stressed that Australia's involvement was not directly related to "star wars" and would end next year. Australian defense vessels and aircraft will be used to test the satellite system using infrared rays. Mr Beazley said that the project had some benefits for Australia in the long term because of surveillance problems here. He said infrared sensing was a good way of providing surveillance of opponents with electronic warfare systems. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 10 May 85 BK]

CSO: 5200/4318

SALT/START ISSUES

PRAVDA LISTS ALLEGED U.S. VIOLATIONS OF SALT, ABM TREATIES

PM111804 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 85 First Edition p 5

[Article by I. Zakharov: "The United States Violates Its Own Commitments"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The PRAVDA editorial offices have received many letters linked with the publication of items on Reagan's "star wars" program. These letters testify to the profound alarm felt by Soviet people, like broad circles of the world public, over the aggressive U.S. course aimed at achieving military supremacy for itself. One of the questions most frequently asked is: How do such U.S. actions square with the legal and political commitments the United States has assumed in the field of strategic arms limitation?

On frequent occasions recently, the Soviet Government has drawn the U.S. Government's attention to the inadmissibility of disregarding its assumed commitments. A principled assessment of U.S. actions aimed at circumventing arms control agreements was given in the Soviet memorandum conveyed to the State Department in January 1984 and the TASS statement and USSR Foreign Ministry announcement published in PRAVDA on 21 October 1984 and 28 February 1985, respectively. These documents describe the U.S. approach to the arms limitation and reduction process itself and to the fulfillment of the legal and political commitments it has assumed in various fields -- from strategic to conventional arms and from treaties as a whole to individual provisions thereof. These assessments of U.S. actions and the Soviet Union's attitude to them retain their validity wholly and completely.

The strategic arms limitation agreements include: the Soviet-U.S. open-ended Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Defense Systems (the ABM Treaty) and interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms (both were concluded in May 1972 and relate to the SALT I stage of negotiations) and also the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT II), which was signed in 1979 but has not been ratified through the fault of the United States. It should be noted that after the expiration of the interim agreement, the sides exchanged official statements confirming that the commitments arising from the agreement remain in force. There is also an official U.S. Government statement of intent not to take actions that would undermine the provisions of SALT II. These three agreements basically regulate Soviet-U.S. relations in the field of strategic arms.

How do things stand in terms of the U.S. fulfillment of its commitments under these accords? Being of unlimited duration, the ABM Treaty is the main obstacle to the implementation of the U.S. Administration's schemes for acquiring military superiority in the world. The "Strategic Defense Initiative" proclaimed by the U.S. President, which has been christened the "star wars" program, envisages the creation of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, which blatantly violates the spirit and letter of this treaty. Thus, Article I of the treaty records the parties' commitment "not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of the territory of its country and not to provide a base for such defense," while Article V records a commitment "not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-, air-, space-, or mobile land-based."

What is now being planned in the United States, of course, is not "defense" or the development of "ABM means." These words are used to conceal the essence of the matter, which is a plan to develop a dangerous new class of arms: space strike systems intended to become a weighty addition to the U.S. nuclear arsenal and secure an opportunity for the United States to launch a surprise first nuclear strike with impunity.

Washington is advancing spurious arguments in an attempt to justify the "star wars" plans. Arguments that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is nothing more than research, which is allegedly not prohibited by the ABM Treaty, are fashionable there. This is a deliberate untruth. For a long time now, it has been a question not of "innocuous scientific research" but of targeted programs for the development of space strike arms. This work essentially pursues the objective of destroying the ABM Treaty and is incompatible both with the objectives of the treaty as a whole and the specific provisions contained in its articles.

First, the very objective of the so-called "research" -- the development of space strike arms and an all-embracing ABM system -- fundamentally contradicts the treaty. Second, the measures the U.S. Administration is taking even now testify that what is being conducted is targeted work envisioning the development of models of space arms to be followed by the appearance and deployment of this new class of arms. The proposed "peace" of this work can be judged from the astronomic appropriations for it: \$26 billion over the next 5 years, which Washington plainly does not intent to spend on "pure science." Third, the intention of starting tests of these arms and their components in a couple of years has been openly announced. Fourth, Washington makes no secret of the fact that it intends to implement its plan at any price, up to overt abandonment of observance of existing accords. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has stated shamelessly on this score: "At the present stage we are conducting research work with a view to determining whether a totally reliable system can be developed. If it can, we will have to go outside the framework of the ABM Treaty."

Other facts also testify to the U.S. side's arbitrary, to put it mildly, treatment of the provisions of the ABM Treaty.

Shemya Island (in the Aleutians) houses a large radar station where use was made of components tested for ABM defense purposes in violation of the agreed accords during its construction. This station can be used for the creation of a radar field for the ABM defense of U.S. territory, which contradicts the commitment made under Article I of the ABM Treaty.

An analogous violation of the treaty -- the creation of a radar field covering a large part of U.S. territory -- is the construction of large radar stations of the "Pave Paws" type, whose tactical and technical specifications match the requirements of ABM radar stations. Two of them have already been built on the western and eastern seaboards of the United States, and construction of another two is in progress in the south.

In violation of the commitment "not to deploy in the future radars for early warning of strategic ballistic missile attack except at locations along the periphery of its national territory and oriented outward" (Article VI), the United States is building a big "Pave Paws" radar station far beyond the borders of its territory in Greenland.

The United States is carrying out work to develop components and systems prohibited by the treaty, particularly mobile ABM radars and multiple warheads for ABM's; Minuteman ICBM's are being tested to give them ABM capabilities. This also violates commitments assumed by the United States under the treaty.

Another patent violation of the ABM treaty is the fact that Washington is currently making persistent efforts to involve its allies in the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" announced by Reagan.

The list of U.S. violations in the field of strategic offensive arms, a field where the commitments of the Soviet Union and the United States are governed by the interim agreement and the SALT II treaty, is equally extensive.

In these documents, the parties acknowledged the existence of strategic balance and defined measures promoting the maintenance of this balance in the future. This does not please the Washington administration, which intends to change the correlation of forces in its favor and attempt to achieve military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. It is attempting to find loopholes in the treaties, and where it cannot find any it goes in for direct violations.

For example, the nondeployment of long-range sea- and land-based cruise missiles was stipulated by the protocol to the SALT II treaty, which is an integral part of the treaty. By refusing to ratify the treaty, the U.S. side violated this accord and, having blocked the further resolution of the cruise missile question, embarked on the deployment of long-range sea-based cruise missiles on its submarines and surface ships.

The siting of U.S. Pershing II ballistic missiles and cruise missiles in Western Europe also violated a commitment contained in Article XII of the SALT II treaty: not to circumvent this treaty "through any other state or states, or in any other manner," and also "not to assume any international obligations that would conflict with" the treaty (Article XIII). No subterfuges are capable of refuting the fact that the siting of these first strike nuclear means, which can reach targets on the USSR's territory and are a direct addition to the U.S. strategic nuclear potential, violates the maintenance of strategic balance between our countries prescribed by the SALT II treaty.

The question of deliberate concealment measures is also an example of flagrant disregard by the United States of the commitments it has assumed. The parties included in the interim agreement a provision "not to use deliberate concealment measures that impede verification" (Article V). This provision is also recorded in the SALT II treaty.

However, the United States has violated it so often that such violations have become more of the rule than the exception. The U.S. side's use of shelters [ukrytiye] has been observed when it has carried out work on both intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers and submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) launchers. The Soviet Union has repeatedly informed the U.S. side of the illegality of such actions, but the practice of using shelters has continued.

The situation taking shape is especially serious since it undermines confidence in U.S. observance of one of the main accords on the limitation of the number of MIRVed ICBM's. The single-warhead Minuteman II ICBM launchers that have been converted under cover are indistinguishable from the launchers of MIRVed Minuteman-III missiles. This being the case, there are objective reasons to consider that all Minuteman launch silos contain missiles with a minimum of three warheads.

The use of shelters during work on Titan-II ICBM launchers, too, has also been repeatedly noted. Recently the United States has violated the agreed procedures for dismantling such launchers: instead of the stipulated 6-month period for dismantled launchers to remain in the open they have been buried within 1-2 months, which reduces confidence in the effectiveness of dismantlement measures and does not guarantee their irreversibility.

The U.S. Administration's activity also calls into question its readiness to observe Article VI of the SALT-II treaty, which prohibits the development of new types of ICBM (except for one type). The MX type of ICBM has already been developed, and Washington is embarked on the implementation of plans to develop and create yet another type of ICBM, the Midgetman.

These are only some of the examples of the U.S. side's disregard for the spirit and letter of agreements that have been reached.

---

Violations of the provisions of the treaties inevitably undermine the foundation of the package of legal and political norms elaborated in the past decade and has a negative effect on the entire spectrum of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The U.S. line of undermining existing agreements in the field of strategic arms and eroding the system of binding mutual agreements elaborated through joint efforts demonstrates not only Washington's reluctance to follow the path of detente but also its aspiration to seek military superiority over the Soviet Union at any price, despite the fact that the entire history of the arms race has shown the futility of such attempts. As statements from the Soviet leadership have repeatedly noted, the USSR will not allow such superiority and insists that the United States strictly observes the international commitments it has assumed in the field of arms limitation.

CSO: 5200/1157

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

**SWEDISH DAILY DAGENS NYHETER WEIGHS GORBACHEV 'INITIATIVE'**

PM120857 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 9 Apr 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Gorbachev's First Initiative"]

[Excerpts] The new tug-of-war over nuclear arms has begun in earnest. With his decision for an immediate freeze on the deployment of medium-range missiles Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev is addressing himself chiefly to public opinion in West Europe, even though the gesture is directed toward the United States. The two sides' joint silence about the recently begun Geneva negotiations has thus been conspicuously broken by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet leader says that his intention was a joint interim freeze on new nuclear arms in Europe. He invites the United States to follow the Soviet Union's example. It can hardly come as any surprise to anyone that the United States immediately refused. According to Washington, halting deployment of medium-range missiles at the present moment would simply consolidate a Soviet advantage in this particular class of nuclear arms.

No one in the West is likely to deny that this is a correct U.S. observation. Since the end of the seventies the Soviet Union has consistently striven for superior strength -- necessary in Moscow's view because its rival has so many other nuclear arms whose range embraces Europe.

There has been good reason to criticize the Soviet leadership for further accelerating a nuclear arms race in this way. But from the deterrence viewpoint it has not been necessary for the United States to respond in kind. The Americans already have more than enough arms for this purpose. One wishes that the West had refrained from countering the Soviet arms buildup with its own medium-range missiles -- not least to spare the NATO nations divisive internal conflicts. Of course, it would have been highly desirable if the White House had not immediately reacted negatively to Gorbachev's first initiative in the nuclear arms field.

The Eastern offensive in PRAVDA was simply the first step in a major diplomatic offensive against Reagan's "star wars" defenses -- an offensive in which it is of crucial importance for Moscow to enroll a worried Western public opinion on its own side in a major application of pressure on the United States. How much better would it be if the Americans themselves were to see the danger and possible disaster involved in turning space into a potential theater of war and were instead to try to stop both their own and the Soviet leaders' pernicious activities in this new field!

In the past, the Soviet Union has also made interim commitments not to deploy additional medium-range missiles -- chiefly the SS-20 -- without keeping its word in practice, according to U.S. accusations. Unfortunately, a freeze on the further deployment of missiles does not necessarily mean a halt to arms production -- and for this reason the gesture could be worth little.

But the fact remains that the new Soviet leader's signal is an important event. More clearly than ever before Moscow has now accepted the presence of some U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. Many people also take the view that it is perhaps primarily through unilateral initiatives that the two sides in the gruesome nuclear arms game can achieve openings and changes. By pointing at the same time to the fact that relations between the two superpowers are still tense, by setting a November limit for his deployment freeze, and by dropping reminders of his interest in a summit with Reagan, Gorbachev is trying to force his opposite number into swiftly showing his readiness to compromise.

At the present moment it is the Soviet Union which has tried to hustle the United States. It is true that Mikhail Gorbachev has not effected a really promising move. But it would be wrong of the West to ignore his outstretched fist.

CSO: 5200/2593

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SWEDEN'S PALME WELCOMES USSR MISSILE MORATORIUM

PM171355 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 13 Apr 85 p 9

[Report by Lars Christiansson: "Palme Supports Missile Freeze"]

[Text] Prime Minister Olof Palme has welcomed Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's announcement that the Soviet Union will halt its deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and, in the period up to November, refrain from adopting further countermeasures to NATO's deployment of medium-range missiles.

Olof Palme expressed his support for the Soviet decision when he spoke at the opening of a peace seminar for female parliamentarians from different parts of the world. The initiative for the conference was taken by Swedish Disarmament Ambassador Maj Britt Theorin.

Palme said that Gorbachev's initiative could mean the possibility of partial agreements at the Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks in Geneva, provided the United States and NATO reach a corresponding decision to halt the Western deployment of medium-range nuclear arms in Europe.

"This would at least mean a step toward arms control. Such a decision would be a positive contribution after the intentions already announced by NATO, in the Montebello decision, to reduce the number of nuclear warheads in Europe," Palme said.

In her speech Maj Britt Theorin raised several of the steps which the Swedish Government considers would reduce the nuclear threat. Among other things she mentioned the Swedish call for a nuclear-freeze. "Such a decision does not require time-consuming negotiations. The two superpowers could declare a freeze immediately," she said. The disarmament ambassador also stressed the importance of reaching an agreement for a total test ban agreement.

She also said that an agreement between the nuclear powers not to be the first to use nuclear arms would increase confidence and help to counter speculations that it ought to be possible to fight a limited nuclear war.

The conference, which lasted 2 days and is part of the preparations for the UN Women's Conference in Nairobi in July, gathered female parliamentarians from 16 countries. Both the United States and the Soviet Union were represented.

CSO: 5200/2593

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

ITALIAN CP HEAD BACKS SOVIET INITIATIVES

PM031029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 May 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Communist Position"]

[Text] Rome, 1 May -- At a press conference here, A. Natta, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party [PCI], expressed support for the Soviet Union's peace-loving initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race. We consider the USSR's recently announced unilateral moratorium on medium-range missile deployment and its proposal imposing a moratorium on the creation of space weapons to be very important, he said. The PCI, A. Natta continued, welcomed the opening of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva. In our opinion, the accord reached between A.A. Gromyko and G. Shultz to discuss all questions in their interconnection was of special significance. No sooner had the talks begun, however, than clear contradictions were revealed between that accord and the U.S. position.

The PCI secretary general went on to emphasize that the PCI resolutely opposes the U.S. Administration's "star wars" plans, which will fuel the nuclear arms race. We believe that the Italian Government should not associate itself with those U.S. plans, A. Natta noted.

The PCI secretary general paid great attention to the upcoming 12 May local elections in Italy. In this connection A. Natta rejected most resolutely U.S. President R. Reagan's recent attempt to crudely interfere in Italy's internal affairs. In a recent interview, R. Reagan openly stated that "the United States does not want" a communist victory in the elections or the possible concomitant change in the alignment of forces in favor of the PCI. Perhaps the U.S. President is unaware, he observed, that the PCI and the other democratic forces paid a high price for that freedom, which was won with blood.

CSO: 5200/1146

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

NETHERLANDS FOREIGN MINISTER SEES INCREASE IN SS-20'S

PM151423 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 11 Apr 85 p 3

[Report by Raymond van den Boogaard: "Van den Broek Sees Increase in SS-20's"]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 11 Apr -- Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek is disappointed at Moscow's reaction to the Netherlands' 1 June 1984 decision. "I strongly doubt whether our appeal has found a positive response here," he said yesterday after 3 hours of talks with his Soviet counterpart, Andrey Gromyko, in Moscow, chiefly on the subject of medium-range missiles.

A final evaluation [on whether or not to deploy U.S. cruise missiles] will not be carried out by the cabinet until 12 November and will probably be exclusively made on the basis of information provided by the Americans over the number of SS-20's in the Soviet Union. "I do not think that it is right to begin an immediate discussion of whether the American or the Soviet figures are correct. I think that the alliance must adhere to its own figures," Van den Broek said of the possibility that on 1 November the Soviet Union will present different figures for the number of SS-20's.

In yesterday's negotiations this did not happen. Gromyko did not reply to Van den Broek's question about whether the announcement of a moratorium does not implicitly confirm that further SS-20's have been added to the Soviet arsenal since 1 June.

"Really this simply confirmed my conviction," Van den Broek said. "And this will have consequences in the light of the 1 June decision." It was very clear from Van den Broek's statements that he has no intention of departing from the terms of the Netherlands 1 June decision.

According to Van den Broek, during the talks the Netherlands position "was criticized rather than accepted." Gromyko was said to have stated that the Netherlands "is speaking in the past, instead of in the future."

"I cannot say that the reaction showed much understanding," Van den Broek said. Another point was Russian criticism that the Netherlands decision also covers the SS-20's deployed in the Asian part of the Soviet Union. Van den Broek explained that this was necessary in the Netherlands view because of the great mobility of the SS-20 systems.

CSO: 5200/2593

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH LEADERS ON MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

PM201700 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 15 Apr 85 p 3

[Interview with Prime Minister Lubbers and Foreign Minister Van den Broek by Wio Joustra: "The Labor Party Is Trying To Undermine the Cabinet's Peace Policy" -- date not given]

[Text] Seoul -- "The statement by [Labor Party Chairman] Van den Berg [that there would be no deployment of cruise missiles in the Netherlands under a cabinet involving the Labor Party] is of course nothing new. I find it most regrettable that it has proved to be impossible for the Labor Party [PVDA] to back the policy we set in motion with the 1 June 1984 decision and which is also a first attempt to make a contribution to the question of arms control within NATO." This was Prime Minister Lubbers' answer to the question whether the Labor Party with its stance on the deployment of cruise missiles in the Netherlands has put itself outside a possible coalition with the Christian Democratic Appeal.

[Lubbers] I do not find their stance realistic and in foreign policy terms not very productive. I think it is a great pity that the PVDA has failed us on this point and that the Dutch peace and security policy is not being carried by the PVDA.

[Joustra] What sort of repercussions will the PVDA attitude have for the implementation of the 1 June decision?

[Lubbers] If the situation is such that a count of the number of SS-20's on 1 November leads to an agreement with the United States for deployment, we will have to submit it to parliament for its approval and I expect that this approval will be given. Then it will be parliament's judgement, and thus the judgement of our country. These are agreements which we are making internationally. The PVDA also functions within the framework of democracy and I would consider it to be a bad course if the PVDA were to dissociate itself from the decision.

[Joustra] The PVDA considers that there would simply have to be new negotiations. There is still enough time because deployment in the Netherlands will not take place before 1988.

[Lubbers] If you make an enormous effort to turn the tide of the arms race -- and here we are having to do without the support of the PVDA -- it is a fact of paramount importance in a constitutional state that "if you have made an agreement, you must stick to it." It cannot be the case in a democracy which respects its parliament that when on the basis of substantial discussion a decision is taken you can then turn around and say "It has nothing to do with me." I cannot imagine that the PVDA would act like that.

There are two possibilities: either the Soviet Union continues to react positively to our point of departure on arms control or it does not. If the PVDA wants to exert influence on this process, it must adopt a position somewhere along this line, otherwise it will put itself out of the arms control process. The PVDA stance sounds like a clear position, but it is not.

[Joustra] But in a parliamentary democracy an opposition party does after all have the right to its own view?

[Lubbers] I see this as an attempt to undermine cabinet policy and personally I find that sad. Our position which -- chiefly because it diverges from what the other countries in the alliance have done -- bears witness to a great degree of restraint deserves national support. This support it is not being given and, yes, the PVDA is part of the Netherlands.

[Joustra] On 1 June last year you said that the cabinet decision must set something in motion in Moscow. However, is there not very little to see of this?

[Lubbers] It is indeed not a situation of "Isn't everything wonderful." But I do not think that cynicism, which is completely pointless, is very fruitful. Talks are again taking place in Geneva. I am not so pessimistic. On the other hand I cannot give any estimate of the time that possible results will take. But it is not impossible that there is nothing happening in the arms control field.

What I do not understand is why the PVDA is setting itself outside all of this. That is not a tenable position. And this position is not that different from the PVDA's views with regard to socioeconomic questions. The maintenance of purchasing power within the framework of economic growth and the restoration of full employment does not always need to be a goal. These are political questions which you cannot divorce from the facts and that is what the PVDA is doing now. Peace and security policy questions are too important for the PVDA to brush aside like that.

[Joustra] But for the time being it is the case that on the Soviet side there are now more SS-20'S deployed than there were on 1 June last year, namely 414 instead of 378.

[Lubbers] The possibility cannot be ruled out that the Soviet Union is continuing with the deployment of SS-20's although it only needs the numbers above 378 as a bargaining counter at the negotiating table. They have no military significance any more. On the other hand I would say that the Soviet Union's rhetoric was of a different strength than what you hear now and the verbal strategy of the superpowers is never unimportant.

[Van den Broek] I described the Gorbachev interview with PRAVDA on Easter Monday as moderate. The chance of substantive agreement between the superpowers is considerably less if it is preceded by verbal violence rather than in a climate which lends itself more to rapprochement than to condemnations and tough talking. We must not and do not want to rule out the possibility that within the framework of the Geneva negotiations, for example, there might still be some movement in the Soviet position before 1 November. You must not take as your point of departure that the situation today is final. It is a continuing process.

[Joustra] Was any mention made in your talks last week of verification by the Netherlands of the number of SS-20'S deployed at the moment in the Soviet Union?

[Van den Broek] No, but before my departure I said as far as verification is concerned we are and will remain dependent on the information which the Americans give us. My

position is that it would not be good if we were to behave like some arbitrator between figures presented by the Soviet and the U.S. side.

[Lubbers] Of course it is not only a technical problem. In the political context two things could happen: Either because of Geneva the Soviet Union decides to bring the moment for arms control closer and does not hide the fact, or the opposite happens.

[Joustra] On the subject of the SDI you, Mr Van den Broek, adopted a balanced position during the parliamentary debate on your ministry's budget. Now your party [Christian Democratic Appeal] chairman Bukman is saying that we must not bury our heads in the sand. What is the actual cabinet position?

[Van den Broek] We would prefer a joint West European answer to be formulated. Before the Netherlands reaches a decision on participation there must be greater clarity about what the possibilities are and the difficulties which attach to the project.

The cabinet position is not a definite 'no' because at the present time we consider a final judgement on SDI to be completely premature, also because we are talking about a research period of 5 to 10 years. There are of course a number of obvious reservations. So we must look at the extent to which it makes a contribution to international security and stability. Feasibility and cost are two key words.

[Joustra] Thus you do not agree with Bukman's position?

[Van den Broek] It is difficult to give a complete 'yes' to participation until the questions which arise and the possibilities have been properly charted. But it would be unwise to put ourselves outside the research at this point in time because there could be all sorts of technological developments where the Netherlands would be able to make a contribution and which could also be in the Dutch interest.

[Lubbers] I believe that Bukman's analysis is -- and I share it -- that research must not simply be understood in its technical sense, but that research is also necessary for you to be able to reach a political decision. I think it very correct that Van den Broek has fixed the concept so firmly in a European context. It would not surprise me if the political question were to become more important than SDI in itself. The question is what attitude will the European nations adopt toward the United States on this issue.

CSO: 5200/2607

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

NORWAY'S STRAY NOTES 'BROKEN PROMISE' OF 1983 USSR FREEZE

PM011019 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 25 Apr 85 p 3

[Einar Solvoll Report: "Stray: USSR Broke Missile Freeze Promise in 1983"]

[Text] In the light of new Soviet party chief Gorbachev's recent announcement of a Russian freeze on all further missile deployment until November this year, Norwegian Foreign Minister Svenn Stray reminded the Storting in his foreign policy statement yesterday that a similar promise was made in 1983 but was broken.

About this time 2 years ago the Soviet Union promised to halt missile deployments from March to November. Nevertheless it deployed 63 new missiles targeted on Western Europe in that period. In the Storting yesterday Foreign Minister Stray said that, if the West were to follow the example with a similar proposal for a halt on further deployments, this would amount to freezing the imbalance in the Russians' favor. The Soviet Union now has over 1,200 warheads on its SS-20 missiles, against 120 Pershing II and cruise missiles on the Western side.

The foreign minister said that the interim conclusion to be drawn from Gorbachev's declaration must be that it should be taken as an initiative directed as Western opinion. Stray also touched on the Middle East situation and stressed Norway's ever increasing reservations about having UN forces stationed in Lebanon, considering the very small chance they have of meaningful peace work in this area of conflict.

From 1 January 1986 Spain and Portugal will be members of the EEC. Together with Iceland and Turkey, Norway will therefore be the only NATO nation not a member of the Community. There is no reason to hide the fact that this expansion presents a problem for Norway because it feels that there is further reinforcement of the tendency to equate the EEC with Western Europe, the foreign minister said, but he gave assurances that Norway will continue to maintain close contacts with the European political system and the foreign policy cooperation which takes place at that level.

CSO: 5200/2607

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CHINESE JOURNAL ASSESSES GORBACHEV'S SS-20 PROPOSAL

HK071030 Beijing LIAOWANG in Chinese No 17, 29 Apr 85 p 36

[Article by Mei Zhenmin: "Gorbachev's Proposal and U.S.-Soviet Relations"]

[Text] A series of repercussions have arisen since Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, expressed his views on Soviet-U.S. relations on 7 April. Both the Soviet Union and the United States have adopted a pose of some relaxation, which has made people feel that relaxation in U.S.-Soviet relations is difficult and slow.

While expressing his views, Gorbachev stressed the necessity for improving Soviet-U.S. relations, adopted a positive attitude toward Soviet-U.S. summit talks, and said that "it is necessary to bring forward Soviet-U.S. relations at a very high political level." He also put forward a three-point proposal on suspending the manufacturing, testing, and deploying of offensive space weapons; freezing offensive strategic weapons; and stopping deployment of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. He unilaterally declared that the Soviet Union would suspend the deployment of SS-20 missiles in Europe until November this year. Some Western observers were of the opinion that his remarks reflected his intention of improving relations with the United States and could, after all, be accepted as adopting a mild pose toward Washington.

Washington quickly responded to Gorbachev's proposal. Although it was Easter and a Sunday, in just 1 hour after the receipt of the news from Moscow, the White House issued a responsive statement expressing "disappointment" at Gorbachev's proposal. However, the Reagan administration welcomed Gorbachev's positive attitude toward holding a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting but at the same time blamed Gorbachev for not making detailed suggestions on the time, place, and agenda of the meeting. The Reagan administration bluntly refused Gorbachev's three-point proposal, asserting that his proposal on stopping the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe was aimed at maintaining the Soviet's 10 to 1 superiority.

As pointed out by some Western newspapers, Washington made such a quick negative response because the Reagan administration was worried that the antinuclear peace movements in the Western allied countries, Western Europe, and North America would be influenced by Gorbachev's remarks and felt it necessary to set the time early. West European countries are more eager and have probably gone further than the United States in relaxing their relations with the Soviet Union as well as East-West relations. Therefore, the milder the tone of the Soviet Union, the more worried the United States is about Soviet influence on West European countries.

Gorbachev's remarks did arouse repercussions among West European countries. Although most West European countries, like Britain, the FRG, Belgium, and France, refused Gor-

bachev's proposal on stopping the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, differences of opinion arose in NATO. Italian Prime Minister Craxi explicitly expressed a different view saying: "I do not agree with explaining Gorbachev's proposal as a conspiracy. On the contrary, I think that this indicates a prelude to a dialogue. This proposal contains something more than 'no.' It is worth making a counterproposal, at least."

Two of the three ruling parties in Norway maintained that the Western world should treat Gorbachev's proposal seriously and that there would be hope for Western Europe if the United States also stopped the deployment of missiles. Opposition parties in some West European countries held that the West should not bluntly refuse the proposal, as stopping the deployment was better than deploying. Even people in U.S. political circles made different evaluations of Gorbachev and his remarks.

The Soviet Union criticized the negative U.S. attitude toward Gorbachev's proposal. While meeting a delegation from the U.S. House of Representatives on 10 April, Gorbachev said that the U.S. Government "declared its negative attitude toward his proposal in such an incomprehensibly great hurry" that people could not help "casting doubts about U.S. sincerity in holding the Geneva talks."

On 12 April, PRAVDA published a special article refuting Western newspaper comments that the Soviet Union had deployed more medium-range missiles in Europe than the West and pointing out that the medium-range missiles deployed in West Europe by the United States plus British and French nuclear missiles and planes used to carry medium-range nuclear weapons were 50 percent more than the Soviet Union's.

Apart from assailing each other in this battle of words, both sides displayed their "flexibility" to put each other on the spot. On 12 April, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz said that the United States had made a suggestion in Geneva on the large-scale reduction of nuclear weapons but that the Soviet Union had not given an answer. With regard to U.S. criticism that Gorbachev's proposal did not advance the summit talks, on 14 April PRAVDA for the first time expressed Soviet willingness to have regular summit meetings with the United States to improve relations between the two countries. At an arms control forum in Atlanta on 13 April, Dobrynin, the Soviet ambassador to the United States, leaked that the Soviet Union would not persist in concluding simultaneous agreements on the various weapons systems under discussion in Geneva. He added that Moscow would possibly allow observers to visit the large radar station in Siberia which was described by the United States as violating the ABM treaty.

In the latter half of last year, when the United States expressed its willingness to improve U.S.-Soviet relations, the Soviet Union gave it the cold shoulder. Now, when the Soviet Union has expressed its willingness to improve bilateral relations, the United States remains indifferent. It is not strange for such a situation to have emerged, as they have been each other's opponents for a long time and do not trust each other. However, the deadlocked, tense, and antagonistic situation between the United States and the Soviet Union will finally be replaced by a situation in which dialogue is intertwined with contention. Although the dialogue is very difficult, contention is very fierce, and relaxation is limited and unstable, some relaxation has arisen in the relations between the two countries. After the killing of a U.S. military liaison officer by a Soviet soldier in the GDR, both sides still maintained a positive attitude toward the convening of a summit meeting. This indicates that the relaxation that has emerged between the two countries will continue to progress.

CSO: 5200/4035

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

U.S. STATISTICS TO BE USED IN NETHERLANDS MISSILE DECISION

AU251447 Paris AFP in English 1444 GMT 25 Apr 85

[Text] The Hague, April 25 (AFP)--In the absence of information from Moscow, the Netherlands will base itself on figures supplied by the United States on the number of Soviet SS-20 missiles when it decides on November 1 whether to go ahead with the scheduled deployment of 48 NATO missiles on its territory. Foreign Minister Hans van den Broek reiterated this last night before the parliament, saying Dutch officials would accept a U.S. count that said 378 medium-range SS-20 nuclear missiles were deployed on Soviet territory last June 1.

Last June, the Dutch Government had voted to install the 48 missiles--which will be deployed under a North Atlantic Treaty Organization timetable after that a final vote by the Dutch Parliament--if Moscow does not freeze the number of its SS-20's at the June 1 level.

Mr Van den Broek said yesterday that the government still held to this position.

U.S. reports say the Soviets have continued deployment since last June, and now have a total of 414 SS-20's. A Soviet diplomat here confirmed these figures, but ruled out the possibility of any return to the deployment level of June 1.

Mr Van den Broek said the parliament would base its final decision on figures supplied by the United States, even if these should be contradicted by the Soviet Union. Until now, Moscow has refused to reveal the number of its missiles, but has never contested the U.S. count.

The Netherlands is the last of 5 NATO countries to vote on whether to accept its quota of the 572 medium-range missiles to be deployed in Western Europe. The other four, West Germany, Britain, Italy and Belgium, have all agreed to go ahead with deployment of their share of the missiles.

CSO: 5200/2593

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

ROMANIAN ENVOY ADDRESSES STOCKHOLM CSCE MEETING

AU142209 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 1850 GMT 14 May 85

[Text] Stockholm, AGERPRES 14/5/1985 -- In his address during the first-day proceedings of the new session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-and-Security-Building Measures and on Disarmament in Europe, the Romanian chief delegate underscored the need to step up the conference's activities and brought to the fore the requirement for work to be carried out more firmly for the meeting to proceed in a constructive spirit and yield fine results. The constructive premises created from the very beginning of the all-European forum in Stockholm -- in January last year -- which were consolidated over the last few months, the speaker pointed out, require and create opportunities for efforts to be stepped up during the conference, particularly as concerns the broadening of the scope of agreement between the participating countries. In this respect, the working bodies of the conference must be used more intensely, just as the unofficial framework of consultations for the channeling of efforts toward the rapprochement and harmonization of the states' viewpoints.

In the same sphere of concerns, it would be useful to start consultations with a view to identifying elements which might make up a package of substantial and balanced confidence and security-building measures, apt to provide the framework of a first agreement.

The Romanian representative further set forth the confidence-and security-building measures envisaged by his country, among which: the reassertion and consolidation of all states' obligations to renounce the use and threat of force; development and improvement of the confidence-building measures contained in the Helsinki Final Act; the setting of limits on the armed forces participating in military exercises, to number and duration of such exercises, and the cessation of military exercises along the borders of other states and in other sensitive areas of the continent; development of communication and consultations between participating states on questions related to their security; prevention and peaceful resolution of crises.

Reiterating the significance which Romania attaches to the Stockholm conference, the speaker underscored the need to spare no efforts to conclude it with fine results, so that the future 1986 CSCE meeting in Vienna might decide a passage to the stage devoted to disarmament in Europe.

CSO: 5200/3046

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. COMMISSION URGES BUILD-UP BEFORE CHEMICAL ARMS BAN

PM061327 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 May 85 Second Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent N. Turkatenko report: "Building Up the Chemical Weapons Arsenal"]

[Text] Washington, 3 May -- The Reagan administration is stepping up its pressure to get Congress to satisfy its request for \$1.3 billion to be appropriated in fiscal 1986 for the "modernization" of the U.S. arsenal of chemical weapons.

W. Stoessel, head of the "independent" commission on problems of chemical weapons, which was set up by the White House chief, reported to the Senate Armed Services Committee on the results of "investigations" by the commission whose work, as he admitted, was fully financed by the Pentagon. As was only to be expected, the commission backed the administration's stance on the chemical weapons issue. This stance, which was reflected even in Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's report to Congress last February, could be summed up as follows: The United States would apparently like to contribute toward the total ban of chemical weapons but, in order to achieve this, it must first... build up its arsenal. Calling for an accelerated production of chemical weapons, Stoessel repeated the Pentagon's false arguments that claim that the existing U.S. arsenal of chemical weapons supposedly has been "reduced" and has "become obsolete." The falsity of such arguments is proved by the fact that, in the experts' opinion, the United States already has at its disposal a major potential of chemical weapons. The stockpiles are calculated at 150,000 metric tons of combat toxic agents, and the quantity of munitions at 3 million units.

The commission especially supported the Pentagon's demands to create a mighty arsenal of a new generation of mass destruction weapons, that is, binary ammunition inducing nerve paralysis. For this purpose the administration is asking Congress for \$163 million in fiscal 1986 to complete the construction of a special enterprise in Pine Bluff (Arkansas) so as to set at full speed the "production line of death" for the output of binary bombs and artillery shells.

CSO: 5200/1150

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW RADIO NOTES ISSUE OF S.E. ASIA NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

U.S. Opposition

BK081541 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1330 GMT 7 Mar 85

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA commentary: "A Serious Conflict"--date not given]

[Text] The U.S. assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, Wolfowitz, has been on a 5-day official visit to Jakarta. According to political observers, the aim of the visit was to heighten tension in the region and double efforts to draw Southeast Asian countries into the orbit of the Pentagon's military strategy.

Serious differences of opinion on a number of key international issues emerged during the talks between Wolfowitz and President Suharto and other Indonesian high-ranking officials in Jakarta. To quote an example, Wolfowitz opposed ASEAN's proposed declaration of a nuclear-free zone to ensure peace and stability in Southeast Asia. In his efforts to soothe anxiety in Southeast Asia, especially in Indonesia, over the hegemonic nature of Beijing's foreign policy, Wolfowitz, who arrived in Jakarta from the PRC capital, sought to justify the strengthening of military cooperation between the PRC and the United States by saying that a weak PRC will not contribute anything to peace efforts in the Asia-Pacific region. The U.S. roving envoy's remarks were greeted with suspicion in Jakarta.

Positive Soviet Attitude

LD102239 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 10 Mar 85

[Excerpt] By deploying nuclear weapons in this or that country the United States wants to use it as a springboard for attacking the USSR. Under the circumstances the Soviet Union has only one choice: to take the necessary defensive measures. The Soviet leadership has said that those who let first strike nuclear weaponry targeted on neighbor countries be stationed on their soil run the risk of suffering a retaliatory strike. By letting nuclear arms be deployed on its soil this or that country turns

into America's nuclear hostage. This conforms to America's strategy. The United States believes that when it unleashes a nuclear war retaliatory strikes will be dealt first of all on those countries where its advance nuclear outposts are located. United States strategists hope that this will weaken the retaliatory strike dealt on their own territory which will enable them to survive by having sacrificed others.

ASEAN countries come to realize the danger of America's adventuristic and aggressive course increasingly better. Lately their officials have been discussing the proposal on proclaiming Southeast Asia as a nuclear-free zone increasingly often. As for the Soviet Union, it is ready to legally express its pledge not to use nuclear arms against the countries on whose territory no such weaponry is sited by means of signing multilateral or bilateral agreements.

CSO: 1812/186

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWEGIAN, FINNISH OFFICIALS MEET ON NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

Vayrynen on Talks

LD191029 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 0830 GMT 19 Apr 85

[Text] After talks with Norwegian Prime Minister Kaare Willoch and Foreign Minister Svenn Stray, Finland's Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen said on Thursday that Finland and Norway find it easy to understand each other's policies.

At a press conference in Oslo Thursday afternoon, Mr Vayrynen said that the discussions had touched on East-West relations, the situation in Europe and Northern Europe, the conference on security and cooperation in Europe and arms control. On Thursday evening the Finnish Foreign Minister discussed Finnish views on Nordic security in his speech at an official dinner given by Norwegian Foreign Minister Stray. (Olivia Ridenfrost) has this report.

[Begin recording] Speaking at a dinner given by his host, Mr Svenn Stray Thursday evening, Finland's Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen said that the basic structure of security in the North had remained intact. Vayrynen said in addition to the Finnish proposal of a Nordic nuclear weapons-free zone, which Finland still considers important, Finland is also prepared to accept other measures for strengthening confidence and security in Northern Europe. Mr Vayrynen said that it was important for the Nordic countries to take each other and the collective situation of the Nordic region into consideration when making decisions on security policy. The Finnish foreign minister also said that he hoped that the great powers would continue to refrain from taking action that might increase tension in the Nordic region. On the subject of the disarmament talks of the great powers, Mr Vayrynen expressed hopes that they would result in great reductions in nuclear armaments. He considered an agreement on limiting cruise missiles particularly important. Vayrynen also said that outer space should not become a new arena of the arms race but that it should be utilized for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

On the subject of Finnish-Norwegian trade, Mr Vayrynen saw room for improvement, even though he conceded that the growth in trade between the two countries had been swift during the past few years. The Finnish foreign minister also noted that the increase of Norwegian tourism in Finland is a new and positive development in Finnish-Norwegian relations. Mr Vayrynen saw promising opportunities for cooperation in the North [words indistinct] region in oil exploration and production in the off-shore field with northern Norway. In his dinner speech Foreign Minister Vayrynen did not mention the Finnish proposal for a border peace agreement between Finland and Norway which had come up during the discussions he had with his Norwegian counterpart. The Norwegian position is that there is no need to make a separate agreement formalizing the problem-free status quo. [end recording]

Vayrynen Comments on Talks

LD192048 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1900 GMT 19 Apr 85

[Excerpt] Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen says that he is surprised at the willingness of the Norwegian prime minister to discuss the Nordic nuclear weapons free zone. Vayrynen holds the view that prime minister Kaare Willoch adopted an unexpectedly positive stand on the idea of establishing such a zone. Vayrynen expressed this view in Tromsøe. Vayrynen had talks yesterday in Norway with both the prime minister and the foreign minister. Marja Nikkilæ reports:

Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen has during his visit to Norway several times noted that the Finnish-Norwegian relations are in good shape. A new positive point is unquestionably found in the Norwegians' unexpected willingness to discuss the Nordic nuclear-weapons free zone. Vayrynen said in Tromsøe today that he was surprised that Prime Minister Kaare Willoch wanted during yesterday's talks to discuss the details of a nuclear-weapons free zone. Until now it has been usual in the high-level Nordic talks that the governments of NATO countries Norway and Denmark have avoided an exchange of views over the zone issue claiming that the implementation of the project is not appropriate. Vayrynen did not want to speculate on the reasons why the Norwegians now clearly took a more positive stance on discussing the project. In yesterday's talks Willoch posed a number of questions, and the discussion dealt with the general structure that would lead to a nuclear-free zone. Willoch had stressed his view that the zone project must be in every respect well balanced. Norway is also interested to know what steps the Soviet Union is willing to take on its own territories adjacent to the zone.

The Soviet Union, however, has not wanted to specify its own plans before the Nordic countries reach a clearer mutual understanding about the establishment of the zone. Vayrynen's talks in Oslo hardly indicate a breakthrough in the zone issue, as the official Norwegian opinions continue to note very clearly that the Nordic nuclear-weapons free zone can be dealt with in negotiations only when the progress of the talks of the big powers in Geneva can be estimated. It is also obvious that within NATO, Norway is not ready for any solo performance. Thus Norway's stance on the zone is decided in the first place by the line of the NATO nuclear arms control talks.

CSO: 5200/2609

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWAY'S STRAY COMMENTS ON NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE, FINLAND

LD171627 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 1500 GMT 17 Apr 85

[Text] Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen begins an official visit to Norway tomorrow. During the visit there will be talks on East-West relations, the situation in the north of Europe and bilateral relations between Norway and Finland. In an interview with the Finnish Broadcasting Company Norwegian Foreign Minister Svenn Stray reiterates his country's well-known views on the Nordic nuclear-free zone, among other things. Stray does not regard it as appropriate to discuss Finnish proposals for a border treaty between the countries or for reciprocal declarations on this matter.

Here is a report by Marja Nikkila:

At today's interview the Norwegian message was clear: Norway sees the limitation of the number and deployment of nuclear weapons as primarily a matter for talks between the nuclear powers. A Nordic nuclear-free zone will be appropriate only after it is seen how the talks of the big powers in Geneva progress. Norway stresses that a treaty on a nuclear-free Nordic zone is part of an arrangement concerning the whole of Europe.

Norway is carrying out its own investigations into the zone idea, and when the time is ripe, these will be presented also to the NATO partners. Quite clearly now is not the time in the view of the Norwegian Government.

But even the nonsocialist Norwegian Government has not rejected the idea of a nuclear-free zone. In its view its own stance is a realistic way of proceeding in the matter.

In order to further strengthen security in the north, the Finnish foreign political leadership since the middle of the 1960's has been offering its proposal for the conclusion of a Finnish-Norwegian border treaty. Only a few days ago Foreign Minister Vayrynen reiterated this stance in a press interview. The Norwegians are not enthusiastic about this proposal, and therefore during President Mauno Koivisto's visit to Norway a couple of years ago the idea of parallel political declarations was proposed in which the Finnish and Norwegian Government would stress the importance of preserving peace in the northern border areas.

This is what Foreign Minister Stray had to say about this proposal today:

[Begin recording in Norwegian fading into Finnish translation] Stray says that such declarations are not appropriate between countries as close as Finland and Norway.

Such declarations (?would lead) elsewhere in the world to misunderstandings. They might wonder why such assurances as proposed would be needed here in the north. Stray says he considers the declarations to be totally unnecessary.

Although the Finnish and Norwegian views on the measures demanded by the security situation in the north differ considerably, Stray thinks that both countries understand fairly well the situation and position of the other country; in other words that each keeps presenting its own views from its own interests.

Recently the straying of the Soviet missile into Finnish and Norwegian airspace led to a very different use of words in Norway and Finland. According to Stray, the Finnish statements caused some wonder in Norway. The nonsocialist Government of Norway has not dramatized the recent missile incident, and Stray says that the incident has not created tension in relations between Norway and the Soviet Union. It was a training missile which strayed accidentally into Finnish and Norwegian airspace, Stray emphasizes. He does not believe that it will be necessary to discuss the missile incident during Foreign Minister Vayrynen's visit.

At the present time security policy is not a hot domestic policy issue in Norway. Elections will take place in the country next fall, and Foreign Minister Stray does not believe that security policy will become a very heated election issue. But the situation may change, he says. Norway, as a NATO country, will have to adopt a stance, for instance, on the so-called "star wars" program of the United States. At the same time as Foreign Minister Stray emphasizes Norway's stance according to which everything possible must be done to prevent an arms race in space, he equally strongly describes the program now started by the United States purely as a research program.

Stray says that Norway has not found any reason for the United States to halt this research program. One reason for the Norwegian stance, according to Stray, is the fact that such research has been under way in the Soviet Union, too. But just as in other NATO countries, so also in Norway one can predict severe domestic political struggles in the discussion of this matter. [end recording]

CSO: 5200/2609

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPSALS

FINLAND'S KOIVISTO ADVOCATES NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

LD200907 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 0500 GMT 20 Apr 85

[Text] President Mauno Koivisto points out that as long as realistic possibilities exist for bringing about an extensive arrangement, confirmed by agreements, for a nuclear weapons-free north, one should strive for it.

In an interview published in Social Democratic papers today, President Koivisto referred to an idea sometimes floated in public that Finland and Sweden should by unilateral means proclaim themselves to be a nuclear weapons-free zone. According to the president, the idea of a Nordic nuclear weapons-free zone has met with quite a different response in the last few years in the other Nordic countries than before. The discussion on this project conducted over the last few years has been very satisfactory from our point of view. The discussion has largely led to the adoption of an idea which corresponds to our thinking too; namely that the zone should cover the territory of the Nordic countries connected with it, but this solution should have an effect outside this region too. According to Koivisto, it is a matter above all of the Nordic countries' own endeavors. After that, it is a matter of the attitude of those countries which have nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has demonstrated its interest and understanding for this project to an increasing degree. On the American side the view have been variable. A suspicious and, in some cases, a clearly negative attitude has been chiefly prevalent, the president thought.

Speaking about some recent domestic views on South Africa, President Koivisto thinks that they clearly contain a topical tactical taint. He believes that with regard to South Africa we will have to face very problematic questions. If there is no gradual or soft transition to majority power, there will be critical changes. This poses difficult moral questions for all the Western countries.

CSO: 5200/2609

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWEGIAN MP'S: CHANGE GOVERNMENT TO SET UP ZONE

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 30 Apr 85 p 3

[Article by Bjorn Talen: "Haarstad (Center Party) Agrees With Liberal Opposition: Change of Government Necessary for Nuclear Free Zone"]

[Text] Norway needs a new government if there is to be any progress in efforts toward a treaty-based nuclear free zone in the Nordic area. This was asserted by the Labor Party's Thorbjorn Berntsen and the Socialist Left's Hanna Kvanmo at a Nordic press conference which was arranged at Holmenkollen yesterday. It was more noteworthy, however, that Member of Parliament Ragnhild Q. Haarstad of the Center Party agreed with the position.

"Treaty Now"--the Nordic movement for a treaty establishing the Nordic area as a nuclear free zone--had gathered together a group of parliamentarians from the Nordic countries yesterday in order to demonstrate its support for the movement. The Finnish Social Democrat Saara-Maria Paakinen was able to state that 160 of the 200 members of the Finnish parliament had signed a petition of support.

The movement has received support from Parliament from among the Labor Party delegation, the Socialist Left and five non-socialist representatives: Hans Hammond Rossbach and Mons Espelid from the Liberal Party, Ragnhild Q. Haarstad and Lars Velsand from the Center Party, and Christian Democrat Johannes Vagsnes. "More undoubtedly would have signed if there had been more time," Ragnhild Q. Haarstad asserted.

"The problem is that, in contrast with the other Nordic national legislatures, there is no outspoken majority in the Norwegian parliament," states a Dane, Pelle Voigt. And from the Norwegian side, all blame was placed on the Conservatives. "It is a fact that the Conservatives are a brake block in this matter as well as on the issue of a freeze," said Thorbjorn Berntsen, who added that without the opposition from the Conservatives, the work would have made progress long ago.

"It is only the Conservatives who are resisting. It is impossible to get Prime Minister Kare Willoch and others to understand that it is not a unilateral agreement with the Soviets which we support," stated Hanna Kvanmo. And Hans Hammond Rossbach instituted a search for the political will within the government.

It was regarding the issue of whether she also agreed that a new government was necessary in order for there to be any progress in the treaty movement that Ragnhild Q. Haarstad made the following statement:

"Yes, unfortunately. I would wish that I would be able to answer 'No' to the question." But she emphasized as well that this applied to this particular issue. A short time ago, this Center Party representative caused further attention by asserting that she preferred cooperating with the Labor Party on cultural politics.

"The treaty effort creates special problems in Norway and Denmark by reason of their membership in NATO. But all Norwegian parties, with the exception of the Conservative Party and the Progress Party, have included in their platforms to strive toward creating the Nordic area as a nuclear free zone. The most serious hindrance is that the largest governing party is so negatively disposed," were among the comments she had to make.

12578

CSO: 5200/2605

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SWEDISH FOREIGN MINISTRY AIDE SUPPORTS NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

PM190852 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 15 Apr 85 p 8

[TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA interview with Swedish Foreign Ministry Under Secretary Pierre Schori: "Support for Nuclear-Free Zone"]

[Text] "A nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area has strong popular support which must be welcomed because it makes a contribution to the democratization of disarmament policy," Foreign Ministry Under Secretary Pierre Schori said in a TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA interview.

"Sweden has gone far in the internal work on a nuclear-free zone and we are prepared to begin consultations on the establishment of a zone with the other Nordic countries.

"Most immediate are bilateral consultations with Denmark and Norway which have appointed committees to study the question and these are consulting us. In addition to continued discussions between the Nordic countries' foreign ministers a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area will also be discussed at a meeting of parliamentarians in Copenhagen in October. All of the Nordic area's political parties will take part."

[Question] Is the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area realistic when it does not have the express support of NATO members Norway and Denmark?

[Shori] The idea of a zone has by no means been rejected in Norway and Denmark. There is a common Nordic view of the value of setting up such a zone. What is being discussed and what views perhaps differ on is the timing and the context. The common fundamental view has been confirmed by the Nordic parliaments.

Norway and Denmark have said expressly that they want to solve the question after consultations with their Nordic neighbors and their allies within NATO. We also consider that it is impossible to reach an agreement without the United States and the Soviet Union.

A nuclear-free zone is not exclusively a question for the nuclear powers. The New Delhi declaration (signed by heads of state and government from Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden) recently said that the fate of the world lies ultimately in the hands of the nuclear powers. This is deeply undemocratic. Other states must also be able to have their say. What is at stake is the survival of us all.

[Question] What is your view of the U.S. role in Central America, especially Nicaragua?

[Schori] That it is characterized far too much by the superpower's lack of tolerance for different political systems.

The only path to a peaceful solution in this region has been shown by the Contadora Group (consisting of representatives of Venezuela, Panama, Colombia, and Mexico). The heart of the group's proposal is that the problems should be solved through political negotiations and not through military actions.

CSO: 5200/2609

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SWEDISH FOREIGN POLICY REPORT DISCUSSES NORDIC ZONE

PM021452 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 28 Mar 85 p 8

[Sven Svensson report: "Nordic Zone To be Pursued Further"]

[Text] Sweden is prepared to enter into concrete negotiations with the other Nordic countries about a nuclear-free zone. This was stated by the government in its foreign policy report to the Riksdag. The document published by the Foreign Ministry on a nuclear-free zone states that Sweden is prepared to continue talks. The fact that the government has now declared its readiness to enter concrete negotiations represents a reinforcement of the government position.

The statement, DAGENS NYHETER has been told, should be interpreted more or less as a summation of the Social Democrats' 3-year term in government. On the Swedish side there is little belief that Denmark and Norway are ready to begin concrete negotiations about the zone. The Norwegian and Danish position is that the discussions for a zone should be seen in a broader European context.

To the extent that it is possible to carry discussions further, this will be at the civil servant level. An important question will be to investigate the possibility of passage in the Baltic and through Oresund and the Danish Belts for warships equipped with nuclear arms.

DAGENS NYHETER has been told that the Swedish position is unambiguous: The Baltic must be completely nuclear-free and the Soviet missiles in the Baltic republics represent a problem. The government's foreign policy declaration states that even in the Nordic area we are increasingly dependent on international developments. The fundamental security policy pattern which grew up in the Nordic area after World War II has persisted despite trials and an international climate that has at times been chilly.

The distrust between the superpowers also casts its shadow over our part of the world, the declaration states. In times of increased tension in particular it is of crucial importance that we act so that the rest of the world's confidence in our desire and capacity to pursue our traditional foreign policy should not be shaken.

The Swedish Government's approach has been purposeful and consistent. We will never accept violations of Swedish territory. We have not hesitated and we will not hesitate to take action against every foreign intruder using our own forces. In order to be able to track down and take action against those making illegal intrusions into our waters, our resources are rapidly being expanded. We are not seeking confrontation

but respect for our sovereignty and for our borders' inviolability, the declaration states. We demand respect for fundamental international legal principles whose observance is necessary if small states are to be able to live securely within protected borders. This is a principle which we cannot abandon. Nor have we hesitated to protest strongly through diplomatic channels in those cases when it has been possible to establish the nationality of the foreign intruder. At the same time, our conclusions must rest on objective and unambiguous foundations if our endeavors to defend our independence and our territorial integrity are to be seen as honestly meant.

We have a clear interest in good and stable relations with the superpowers. We should strive for dialogue even in situations when antagonisms and difficulties occur, the declaration states. The year 1984 was largely a lost year for disarmament endeavors. This year our hopes are linked to the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union have resumed negotiations on both strategic and medium-range nuclear arms, as well as the arms race in space. As long as nuclear arms exist there is also the threat that they will be used. New arms systems also lead to new military countermeasures.

The declaration also condemns the violations of the civilian population of southern Lebanon. A full Israeli withdrawal should take place without delay.

A long section also deals with the policy of apartheid in South Africa. The government voiced the hope that in Helsinki Friday [29 March] the Nordic countries will arrive at an expansion of the Nordic program of action against the policy of racism.

CSO: 5200/2609

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

GDR'S FISCHER LAUDS IDEA OF NUCLEAR-FREE IBERIA

PM101025 Lisbon DIARIO DE NOTICIAS in Portuguese 4 Apr 85 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Keeping Nuclear Weapons Off Iberian Peninsula: Gama's Proposal Welcomed by Oskar Fischer"]

[Text] Yesterday GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer applauded his Portuguese counterpart's statements in support of keeping the Iberian Peninsula nuclear-free.

"The GDR welcomes your remarks to the effect that the Iberian Peninsula should be kept outside the nuclear apparatus," he said. Oskar Fischer made these remarks after signing a highway transport agreement between Portugal and the GDR and reasserted his country's willingness to constitute a "corridor free from nuclear weapons" between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Fischer spoke in favor of the development of bilateral relations of mutual benefit, since "in this way we can contribute to better understanding in Europe and worldwide," he said. He went on: "Without good relations between states with differing social systems it is impossible to create the confidence necessary to resolve the situation."

According to Oskar Fischer, "the peoples need neither militarism nor confrontation but arms limitation and disarmament and the states' recognition and practice of peaceful coexistence." The GDR foreign minister argued next that his country's geographical position "on the dividing line between two social systems and their military alliances in the center of Europe oblige it to do its utmost to avert another war -- which would not be confined to Germany -- and to ensure peace." This is why "the socialist German state pursues its policy of peace and a policy of constructive dialogue," he stressed.

For his part, Jaime Gama expressed his desire to step up relations with the GDR "at the state level." The foreign minister said he hoped that the signing of the highway transport agreement would make bilateral relations "more solid, stable, and specific."

The accord signed yesterday is designed to facilitate commercial transport between the two countries by means of concessions and the lowering of trade barriers. "The accord symbolizes the development and intensification of bilateral relations in all fields," Gama said. With regard to foreign policy Gama said he believed in the role of small and medium nations in the establishment of the climate of confidence indispensable to international detente.

Next the Portuguese foreign minister spoke in favor of the establishment of a "climate of confidence in international relations, especially on the Old Continent," by imparting

continuity to "fruitful cooperation" in the wake of the Stockholm conference. Having announced his intention to appeal at coming meetings for observance of international accords, Jaime Gama stressed that this is a Portuguese contribution "to the diminution of the present proliferation of hotbeds of tension in the various regions of the world, particularly southern Africa, Central America, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia."

CSO: 5200/2564

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

REPORTAGE ON ANZUS RIFT WITH NEW ZEALAND CONTINUES

Hayden Urges Stronger Ties

BK050658 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 5 May 85

[Text] The minister for foreign affairs, Mr Hayden, says that Australia should strengthen its ties with New Zealand. He said Australia should concentrate its energies on ensuring stability in the Pacific region rather than spending them on world crusades. Mr Hayden was addressing a conference organized by the Australian Fabian Society in the Victorian town of Lorne.

He said that while the United States was a superpower, Australia and New Zealand were more effective in the context of the security of the small Pacific states. The foreign minister said New Zealand's policies on nuclear shipping had given the ANZUS alliance a great shake. He hoped it would not be long before the defense arrangement between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States was once again operating normally.

A similar hope was expressed by the New Zealand high commissioner to Australia, Mr Graham Ansel. Mr Ansel told the conference that New Zealand was strengthening its economic and defense activities in the South Pacific region, and this should provide the basis for the United States to reconsider its relationship with New Zealand. However, he emphasized that any trilateral cooperation in the future would be on a more self-reliance basis as far as New Zealand was concerned.

Lange Confirms U.S., Australia Ties

BK030920 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 3 May 85

[Text] The prime minister, Mr Lange, has said that his country's military links with Australia and the United States will continue. Mr Lange referred to New Zealand's military links when announcing plans for increasing his country's defense spending. New Zealand had never believed it could afford to have armed neutrality.

Plans for increased defense spending by New Zealand were drawn up after its nuclear warship ban strained the ANZUS alliance. During his defense expenditure announcement, Mr Lange said Canada could replace Australia as New Zealand's partner in the Sinai multinational force. Australia recently announced that it was withdrawing from the multinational Sinai force.

As a result, Washington has cut off New Zealand from all its defense arrangements, and that primarily includes intelligence sharing. But Mr Hayden's latest warning has not been well received by the Philippines community in Australia. [end recording]

'Kangaroo' Exercise Canceled

HK070852 Hong Kong AFP in English 0816 GMT 7 May 85

[Text] Canberra, May 7 (AFP) -- Australian Defence Minister Kim Beazley today announced the formal cancellation of Kangaroo '85, Australia's major biannual defence exercise with the United States and New Zealand. The Kangaroo series of military exercises usually involves up to 20,000 defence personnel from the United States, Australia and New Zealand, all linked in the ANZUS defence alliance. The cancellation follows the New Zealand refusal in February to allow U.S. warships access to its ports under Wellington's nuclear disarmament policies.

Mr Beazley simultaneously announced that Australia would take part in separate bilateral exercises with the United States and New Zealand. He said the primary U.S. involvement planned for Kangaroo '85 would become the basis for Exercise Coral Sea involving Australian and U.S. maritime, air and land forces. It would be held off the east coast of Australia in October.

Mr Beazley said Australian forces taking part in Coral Sea would include six destroyers, two submarines, four patrol craft, four support ships plus F-111, Mirage and Orion aircraft, two Air Force radar units and Army air defence missiles. They would exercise with "significant U.S. Navy, Army and Air Force elements," he said. About 5,500 personnel would be involved. Exercise Coral Sea would be followed by Tasman Warrior involving mainly land and air forces from Australia and New Zealand exercising in the Shaolwater Bay training area near Rockhampton in Queensland.

CSO: 5200/4317

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

REBEL AUSTRALIAN LABOR MP'S FORM ANTI-NUCLEAR GROUP

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 30 Mar 85 p 7

[Text]

**NZPA**

At least 28 backbench members of the Federal Labour caucus have joined a new group known as Labour Parliamentarians for a Nuclear-free Australia, aimed at promoting the anti-nuclear issue.

Sources within the group say it is definitely not just a new code name for the Labour Party's left wing, but has attracted support from members of all Labour factions who want to force the party to take a stronger stand on anti-nuclear issues.

The impetus for the group's formation was the encouragement it received from the Government's rejection of the United States' invitation to take part in

research on the "Star Wars" strategic defence initiative.

It also follows closely on the heels of the Prime Minister's backdown on the MX missile.

**Avoided**

Issues the group will take up include visits by nuclear ships, United States bases, a nuclear-free Pacific and uranium mining — an issue of Labour Party policy

which the sources say "is by no means finished."

The group also intends to cultivate growing support for anti-nuclear issues within the public, trade unions and the Labour Party movement Australia-wide by issuing a newsletter and initiating a programme of research, discussion and seminars with prominent guest speakers.

Sources said the group was not intended to subvert the Government, but to force it to take a stand — and to be seen to take a stand — on anti-nuclear issues it had previously avoided and thereby lost electoral support.

Non-left MPs who have joined the group include the former Queensland Opposition leader, Mr Keith Wright (a member of the Prime Minister's right faction), Mr Bob Chynoweth (Victoria, right), Mr John Langmore (Australian Capital Territory, non-aligned),

Mr Neil O'Keefe, Mr Tony Lamb and Senator Barney Cooney (Victorian independent group), Government whip Mr Barry Humphreys (Queensland, right) and Helen Mayer (Victoria, centre left).

**Intensity**

A letter sent to federal Labour Party caucus members on Thursday seeking their support for the group notes that the MX missile issue illustrated that the Government could respond to the concern of party members and the public.

"Labour Parliamentarians for a Nuclear-Free Australia will take a high profile role in working for a nuclear-free Australia," it said.

"Our task is twofold. Firstly we will intensify the campaign nationally within the ALP to advance the cause of a nuclear-free Australia and to encourage greater party debate and understanding of such anti-nuclear issues.

Secondly, we must eventually win back Labour's natural constituency.

It was also hoped that it would revitalise the anti-nuclear movement across Australia.

CSO: 5200/4319

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND OPPOSITION LEADER CRITICIZES NUCLEAR POLICY

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 28 Mar 85 p 4

[Text]

**NZPA      Canberra**  
New Zealand's nuclear ships ban is having a serious impact on its relations with South Pacific Governments as well as Australia, the United States and the Western alliance, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr McLay, said in Canberra.

He told the National Press Club that, as a result, there would be significant changes in the South Pacific, and several governments had already voiced concern in Wellington.

He predicted that the United States would take a greater role in the region and that the Soviet Union would try to "match" the United States.

**Consultation**

"Concern has already been expressed by the Governments of Fiji, Western Samoa, Tonga and the Cook Islands," he said.

"It would appear that

there has been no prior consultation with those Governments or those of other Pacific Island countries on the New Zealand policy."

He said that because of the role played by the Anzus partners, the United States had felt no need to maintain a high profile in the region, and the Soviets were also effectively kept out.

He said he agreed with the Prime Minister, Mr Lange, that there was now evidence of a considerable Soviet diplomatic initiative to establish a presence in the South Pacific unrelated to Soviet economic interests.

**Unfriendly**

"Indeed, in the past, they have endeavoured to obtain the use of port facilities at Nuku'alofa and Tonga. And just last week it was reported that Kiribati was considering entering into a fishing agreement with the Soviet Union . . .

"Add to that the considerable uncertainty about the future of New Caledonia and particularly the possibility of an independent

Kanak-led state strongly influenced by elements unfriendly to Australia and New Zealand, and you have a very significant shift in the stability of the South Pacific."

He said that with the cancellation of the Anzus council meeting, New Zealand and Australia lacked a formal forum in which to talk.

**Treaty**

"Something must be found to replace it on a bilateral basis."

But he said later in answer to a question that there would be no move to a formal diplomatic treaty between Australia and New Zealand because that would smack of a political union which would not be acceptable in New Zealand.

He told questioners he did not expect trade sanctions from the United States in the meantime but said the greatest danger for New Zealand came from protectionist legislation which could harm New Zealand trade now there was less political goodwill to block it.

CSO: 5200/4319

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

CANBERRA, WELLINGTON VIEWS 1944 DEFENSE PACT REVIVAL

Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD in English 28 Mar 85 p 4

[Article by Hugh White]

[Text]

CANBERRA: The keystone of the Australian plan to strengthen defence co-operation between Australia and New Zealand in the wake of the ANZUS crisis is a quaint diplomatic fossil called the ANZAC pact of 1944.

Mr Beazley and Mr Hayden are expected to recommend to Cabinet today that this war-time bilateral agreement be revived as a framework for greatly increased defence co-operation which the Government expects to result from the breakdown of ANZUS.

The ANZAC pact, (known in New Zealand with Kiwi perversity as the Canberra Pact) was signed in Canberra early in 1944. It was an ambitious attempt to assert Australian and New Zealand control over the South and South-West Pacific after the war.

The pact became moribund almost as soon as it was signed. It was evident that the large claims it made were not sensible and in the post-war chill, the emphasis soon switched from trying to limit US presence in the area to trying to tie the United States into the region as closely as possible.

That policy came to fruition when the ANZUS treaty was signed in 1951, and the ANZAC Pact sank into the dust of the history books, leaving the South Pacific Forum as almost its only trace.

But the pact is still on the books, and it contains provisions to cover co-operation between the two countries over regional defence.

It provides a useful peg on which to hang the greatly increased defence co-operation which both Wellington and Canberra now seem keen to establish in lieu of the battered ANZUS relationship. In fact, Mr Beazley's visit to New Zealand next week to discuss this co-operation will be held under the aegis of the ANZAC Pact.

In the early 1970s the regular defence talks, which the pact established between ANZAC defence ministers and senior officials, were revived.

Mr Beazley's talks will be the latest in this series, although they will be incomparably more substantial than the rather social gatherings of previous years.

Of course, there is no legal or administrative necessity to base extended trans-Tasman defence co-operation on any particular document like the ANZAC Pact, but the existence of the pact is a political godsend to both Governments at this tense time.

In both countries the pact will give a reassuring aura of order and substance to what might otherwise have seemed a rather diverse and motley collection of ad hoc arrangements. It will go some way to calm electorates which have become jittery over the collapse of the regional aspects of the largely-symbolic but comforting ANZUS treaty.

Back in 1944 the ANZAC Pact was basically Australia's idea, and was largely the brainchild of the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr H. V. Evatt.

NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES PROPOSALS

SOUTH PACIFIC FORUM WORKS FOR NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE COMPROMISE

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 10 Apr 85 p 20

[Text]

**The South Pacific nuclear-free zone will be a zone of compromise, international surveillance and controls but the attitude of France is seen as a major obstacle.**

A working group of the South Pacific Forum, chaired by Mr David Sadleir, an assistant secretary of the Australian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has conducted its deliberations at Wellington this week, in its third sessions since the forum decided to forge ahead with the proposal.

The problems arise in how far the forum nations want to go geographically in establishing the zone and to what extent they want to exclude nuclear activities in the region.

**Boundary**

French Polynesia may have to be excluded from the agreement because the French Government is unlikely to sign a treaty which calls for an end to nuclear testing.

Similarly the northern geographical boundary of the zone may have to be Kiribati because American weapons testing, and military commitments to its present and former Micronesian trust territories may also be incompatible with the treaty's requirements.

The problems the drafters of the nuclear zone treaty face are spelled out in a New Zealand select committee report on disarmament and arms control.

At Tuvalu last year forum heads of Government asked for a draft treaty which would ban nuclear weapons testing, nuclear waste dumping and storage and the manufacture of nuclear weapons in the region.

The treaty would allow individual forum nations to make their own decisions on the hosting of nuclear warships.

The forum working party has already had to accept the reality that not all forum nations want a total ban on nuclear activities in the region.

Each nation will retain the right to host nuclear warships but that is not regarded as a serious obstacle in working towards a general principle which all South Pacific nations support.

**Spread**

The New Zealand select committee's report suggested a viable South Pacific nuclear-free zone could be established within the limits staked out by the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

That treaty, like the Antarctic Treaty and the Outer Space Treaty, seeks to limit the spread of nuclear weapons by preventing their introduction into areas hitherto free of them.

The Latin America treaty concerns itself with a huge area inhabited by nearly 200 million people, but it has yet to be formally accepted by all Latin American countries.

Cuba is among the few that have not signed the treaty and an irony of that situation is that it was the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 which prompted other Latin American nations to take action.

## Ratified

With the example of the Tlatelolco Treaty before it the forum working party knows it will be necessary for major powers with nuclear weapons to apply the provisions of the treaty to their territories within the zone.

Britain, Holland, France and the United States ratified the Tlatelolco Treaty, but the United States was not prepared to include the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico in it.

A separate United Nations study on the creation of nuclear-free zones states that zones should have the support of nuclear weapon states and from the outset all five nuclear weapon states must give their support to every aspect of any proposed zone.

The New Zealand select committee's report said Russia was likely to place considerable pressure on forum nations for a ban on nuclear ship visits and other forms of transit through the zone.

That move would be unacceptable to the United

States, Britain and probably France, the select committee believes.

The drafters of the South Pacific Treaty have started with the advantage that none of the forum nations is engaged in the manufacture, testing or storage of nuclear weapons, and no major nuclear power — except France — has plans to establish land-based weaponry in the region.

## Safeguards

They are likely to end up with a lengthy document matching the 31 articles and two protocols contained in the Latin American Treaty.

That treaty outlines the obligations of each member nation, defines the territory over which it applies and also nuclear weaponry.

It establishes an agency responsible for consulting member states on zone matters, plus a conference, council and secretariat.

Each contracting nation is obliged to negotiate multilateral or bilateral agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency for the application of its safeguards to

any nuclear activities (for peaceful uses) it may wish to carry out.

That agency is permitted to make special inspections of installations and equipment.

The Latin American treaty is regarded as a permanent one which is intended to remain in force indefinitely, but any party can denounce it by simply notifying the general secretary of the agency giving three months' notice.

From the start the United States gave its support to the Latin American treaty, principally because it did not want another Cuban missile crisis on its doorstep.

## Restricted

There is unlikely to be any strong opposition to the forum's zone, providing its geographical area is restricted to member countries and does not attempt to include French Polynesia and American Micronesian territories.

The forum drafters may take a gamble of attempting to include those areas in its peace plans in anticipation of their joining the treaty on gaining independence.

CSO: 5200/4325

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

**USSR AT LATIN AMERICA NUCLEAR BAN MEET**--A routine session of the general conference of the organization for a ban on nuclear weapons in Latin America has opened in Mexico City. Its agenda includes questions concerning the strict observance of the treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America. Representatives of 23 countries and a number of international organizations are taking part in the work of the session. A delegation from the USSR is attending as an observer. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 8 May 85]

CSO: 5200/1151

NUCLEAR TESTING

SOVIET GENERAL VIEWS NUCLEAR TESTING MORATORIUM CALL

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 22 Apr 85 pp 1-3

[APN item by Maj Gen (Ret) Svyatoslav Kozlov under the rubric "News and Views": "An Efficient Shield Against the Nuclear Threat"]

[Text] Moscow has once again shown its goodwill by expressing its consent to imposing a moratorium on nuclear explosion tests beginning with August 6 of this year, as it has been suggested by the American Defense Information Centre organization.

The Soviet Union has been advocating steadily and for a long time an end to all nuclear blasts. In Soviet opinion, this would prevent the improvement of nuclear weapons and would rule out the danger of accidental injuries of people in peacetime, which sometimes happened. Thanks to the Soviet Union's tireless efforts the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Underwater was signed in 1963.. However, because of the opposition of other nuclear powers, which did not want to lose the opportunity of improving their nuclear weapons, the treaty did not become universal and was not extended to underground space.

Continuing to work for an end to nuclear tests in all media, the USSR showed readiness to conclude agreements which only partly solve the underground explosion problem, justly believing that they nevertheless bring more radical solutions nearer. As a result, in 1974 a USSR-US Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests was signed at the level of 150 kilotons of the TNT equivalent. In 1976 the United States and the Soviet Union signed another treaty: on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. However, up to now these treaties have not come into force because the USA does not submit them to ratification. Nevertheless, the USSR deemed it necessary to continue to work for a universal treaty and held appropriate talks with the USA and Britain. The draft treaty was prepared in the main by 1980. Nothing in it caused doubts, including the system of control over the implementation of the treaty.

However, the US military-industrial complex was against the prospect of being deprived of the opportunity to improve nuclear weapons. Under the influence of the military-industrial complex the US administration went back on its word, referring to the alleged inadequacy of the control system suggested by

the treaty. The issue remains on the agenda of the Geneva Disarmament Conference, but no progress has been made, although as far back as 1983 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the immediate completion of the elaboration of the treaty.

Thus, the proposal by American scientists has a prepared ground, especially taking into account the fact that the Soviet Union has suggested a practical measure such as the declaration of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions by the nuclear powers, starting with a mutually agreed-upon date. It will be natural if, as it has been suggested, August 6, the black 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, is chosen as such a date.

The Soviet Union is convinced that such a moratorium can be proclaimed earlier so that it would operate before the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of all nuclear weapon tests. In present-day conditions the suspension of nuclear blasts could become a major step towards scaling down the nuclear arms race.

The Soviet reply to the appeal by American scientists reaffirms the USSR's readiness for the immediate resumption of the talks on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. The Soviet Union also proposes that the 1974 and 1976 bilateral treaties should be put into effect.

These measures can be taken irrespective of the course of the Geneva-based Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weaponry. At the same time, such measures would create a more favourable atmosphere for the productive development of the Geneva dialogue aimed at preventing the arms race in outer space and at terminating it on earth, which eventually should lead to the complete scrapping of nuclear weapons all over the world.

However, Washington has hastily rejected the proposals by American citizens in the same way as it has actually been rejecting any initiatives and proposals on disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament. It should be recalled that the White House has negatively reacted to the package of nuclear disarmament measures suggested by the Soviet Union. These measures include the code of conduct of the nuclear powers which should make the prevention of a nuclear war the dominant feature of their foreign policy. Washington does not want to take an approach to solving the problem which would include a ban on the tests, production, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons of any type and, as a first step, a freeze or a moratorium.

But the United States has rejected other peaceful initiatives too. It has negatively reacted to the proposal on nuclear-free zones, on the nuclear powers' guarantees not to use nuclear arms against states which do not have nuclear weapons on their territories and which do not want such weapons to be brought to their territories. The same can be said about the American reaction to the proposal to save Europe from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. Finally, Washington's refusal to follow the USSR's example and to take the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons shows quite definitely that the US administration has no political will to solve

the nuclear disarmament problem. The growing arsenals of nuclear weapons and the programme of the militarization of space, which is falsely presented by the White House as the condition for the elimination of nuclear weaponry but which is actually geared to attaining superiority over the USSR and to preparing offensive operations, run counter to the statements by the US administration that it wishes to contribute to the elimination of the nuclear threat hanging over our planet.

CSO: 1812/225

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE URGES TREATIES' RATIFICATION

LD092129 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT 9 May 85

[Text] Washington May 9 TASS -- The Sub-Committee on Control Over Armaments, International Security and Science under the House Foreign Affairs Committee has called upon President Reagan to submit for the Senate for ratification the treaty on limitation of underground tests of nuclear weapons and the treaty on underground nuclear explosions in peaceful purposes. The resolution which was drawn up by the sub-committee contains the call that the USA should enter into negotiations with the USSR on conclusion of the treaty on full and universal prohibition of nuclear tests.

Well-known American scientist, professor of Columbia University, L.R. Sykes stressed at hearings at the sub-committee that ratification of two treaties and conclusion of the treaty on full and universal prohibition of nuclear tests will strengthen U.S. security, slow down the arms race and lessen the threat of a nuclear war. Having ridiculed the assertions on the so-called "violations" by the Soviet Union of accords in that sphere, the scientist accused the Pentagon of providing the Congress and the public with deliberately false data to that effect.

In a statement of the public organisation "Ripon Society" which was distributed at the hearings, it is noted that the treaty on full and universal prohibition of nuclear tests would raise reliable obstacles to creation of new, even more dangerous armaments, would promote the general improvement of the atmosphere on the planet and the attainment of success at the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva.

CSO: 5200/1154

NUCLEAR TESTING

AUSTRALIAN, NEW ZEALAND COMPLAINT ON FRENCH TESTS NOTED

LD111431 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 11 May 85

[Text] New York May 11 TASS -- Australia and New Zealand demanded an end to nuclear tests conducted in the Mururoa Atoll after France had staged another underground explosion there, the second this month, of a nuclear device with a yield of about 150 kilotons, a UPI correspondent reports from Sydney.

This is the 69th and, it is believed, the most powerful explosion conducted in French Polynesia since the time France started nuclear tests there about ten years ago.

Prime Minister David Lange of New Zealand condemned the actions of France, saying that the yield of the latest explosion gave rise to deep concern. All states in the southern part of the Pacific, says a statement issued by the prime minister, have repeatedly expressed resolute protests against nuclear tests in the region.

Acting Foreign Minister of Australia Gareth Evans said in Canberra that the Australian Government condemned another weapon test carried out by France in the Mururoa Atoll. The consequences of that nuclear explosion are particularly dangerous, considering its big yield, he said. There is no justification for French nuclear tests in Polynesia, Gareth Evans stressed.

CSO: 5200/1154

NUCLEAR TESTING

NEW ZEALAND CRITIQUES FRENCH TESTING, IMPACT ON GENEVA TALKS

HK130850 Hong Kong AFP in English 0828 GMT 13 May 85

[Text] Wellington, May 13 (AFP) -- New Zealand said today that the French underground nuclear test site at Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific would have a very limited life if France continued detonating huge nuclear explosions there.

Prime Minister David Lange told reporters that France "cannot conceivably keep detonating 150-kilotonne devices underground at Mururoa and hope that the geology of that area will sustain it." He was commenting on the latest and biggest-ever French test reported at Mururoa Thursday.

"It (France) is flirting with disaster now," said Mr Lange, a long-standing opponent of the French nuclear test programme in the South Pacific. "In a curious way", last week's blast "might be an omen they are going to stop there," he added.

"To continue testing in that way is just absolutely irresponsible. It flies in the face of all Pacific opinion and reinforces the claim that, if they want to do that sort of thing, they should do it in France."

Mr Lange said that New Zealand and its South Pacific neighbours must use international forums such as the United Nations "to see that the disgust of the Pacific at this conduct is registered with the French."

Last week's explosion [was] "something far more" than the trigger devices and other tests for such things as the neutron bomb which the five to 12 kilotonne detonations recorded in the past seemed to represent, Mr Lange said. "This was obviously a major test of what could be one of their new missile or submarine weapons," he added.

Meanwhile, the New Zealand group Scientists Against Nuclear Arms (SANA) warned today warned [as received] that the continued French testing at Mururoa was dashing any hopes of an arms control agreement between the nuclear superpowers.

Physicist Rob Ballagh said it took only one nuclear explosion to make even the superpowers nervous again. "With French testing such powerful bombs for their own immense arsenal of nuclear weapons, they are making the Russians terrified," he said. "It's another wild card thrown into the Geneva arms negotiations," Mr Ballagh told reporters.